



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NATIONAL *EXEMPLA VIRTUTIS* IN ROMAN LITERATURE

BY HENRY WHEATLAND LITCHFIELD

THROUGH the marshlands of northern Campania a slow stream winds to the sea. Broadening and shoaling in their later course, its waters circle the base of a low eminence, from whose summit an abandoned watch-tower looks seaward over the dunes. Modern travel passes far to the eastward, by Capua: twenty centuries have but deepened the solitude which invests the wretched village huddling along the slope, the ruinous masonry which overtops it and gives its name. In the old time, moreover, on a sheltered spur of the central summit, there rose, at a height sufficient to escape the fevers which spring from the lagoon, the dull gray wall of a Roman villa, of no great circuit, set against an unbroken background of ornamental trees. It was an old building in Cicero's day, and already the resort of scores of pious pilgrims whose roll, through succeeding centuries, numbers the statesmen, the soldiers, the poets and historians of the nation. Pliny the antiquarian; the Philosophic Director, welcoming its hospitality for association's sake; Silius Italicus — through the generations they came, with devotion long proof against Christian bigotry, to view the place where Scipio of Africa, censor, twice consul, once triumphator, ended his days amid an outlying farmer's peaceful routine.<sup>1</sup> Roman tradition had many a story of his life on the small estate, and loved to recall how the hero of Zama had thought no shame himself to turn a furrow or loosen the soil about the roots of some favorite nursling. In Pliny's time the farm still harvested from myrtles and olives set by his hand.

Northward from Liternum, in the lower Apennines, a rude cotter's homestead has long since mouldered to dust. Lying deep among the Sabines, the farm was once a favorite haunt of the elder Cato, whose

<sup>1</sup> Sen. *Ep.* 86, *passim*; L. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, 1910<sup>8</sup>, 2, p. 187.

boyhood home was near by; Plutarch tells us<sup>1</sup> he used often of an evening to ramble past its fields, and muse upon the greatness of spirit which, after three triumphs, found in them ample occupation. It was a humble, mean house, this home of the conqueror of Pyrrhus; and coarse as plentiful its fare. No Roman ever tired of telling how a Samnite bribe found Manius Curius roasting turnips in the dusk of his chimney corner: *Malo in fictilibus meis esse, eis qui aurum habent imperare!* The words stuck. When, years afterward, the struggle against Eastern luxury came to its crisis, the moral bias of the ancient episode gave it increased prominence in the minds of old-school Romans, and continued to mould the characters of their descendants through many generations — a homely aroma pervading, as it were, the whole course of Roman ethics, as unmistakable in every writer who catches their true spirit, as it is incapable of confusion with that asceticism which took its place.<sup>2</sup>

"Ancient Rome," said the great historian of morals in Europe, "produced many heroes, but no saint."<sup>3</sup> And he goes on to point out that the type of character which the Romans chiefly held up to admiration, was self-consecrated, not to that abstract of virtue enjoined by religion, but to a concrete purpose — the material prosperity of their Commonwealth. Here as elsewhere, the natural attitude of the practical race was sustained. Whether such devotion lacked much of the spirituality of a quest for the soul's salvation, may perhaps with some justice be questioned.<sup>4</sup> I do not, however, intend to

<sup>1</sup> *Cato Maior*, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Our Lord's birth in a manger, the homeless wanderings by Galilee, are familiar illustrations of the instances by which Christianity seeks to exalt lowliness.

<sup>3</sup> W. E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne*, New York, 1876, vol. 1 (= chaps. 1-3 = pp. xviii + 498), p. 177.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, 1, pp. 212, 186 f.: ". . . The spirit of patriotism has this peculiar characteristic, that while it has evoked acts of heroism which are both very numerous and very sublime, it has done so without presenting any prospect of personal immortality as a reward. Of all the forms of human heroism, it is probably the most unselfish. The Spartan and the Roman died for his country because he loved it. The martyr's ecstasy of hope had no place in his dying hour. He gave up all he had, he closed his eyes, as he believed, for ever, and he asked for no reward in this world or in the next. Even the hope of posthumous fame — the most refined and supersensual of all that can be called reward — could exist only for the most conspicuous leaders. It was examples of this nature that formed the culmi-

raise the point here. In these pages I would call attention less to the subtler influences from which the several virtues spring, than to the effectual attainment of moral worth itself; less to the motives which produced great moral character, more to the validity of such excellence achieved. Of this, a special aspect only will be treated. Given the ideal virtues, founded on a practical basis of patriotic motive, we have to ask: How had the Roman moral teachers, in seeking to inculcate them, been supplying the want which Christianity later satisfied by the inspiration of the lives of Jesus of Nazareth and of His saints? If we find, as surely we shall find, that the age which produced an *Imitatio Christi* was yet, if anything, less given to reliance upon moral instances than was that which preceded it, we shall naturally seek some explanation of their prominence in the Roman ethical system. What were the leading qualities, we shall inquire, chosen to be thus enforced? Who constituted the Examples adopted? Was their range limited, as with the saints of the mediaeval Church, by a formal canon; and if so, how was this established? Did moral teachers at Rome own allegiance to an authoritative Book of Exem-

nations or ideals of ancient systems of virtue, and they naturally led men to draw a very clear and deep distinction between the notions of interest and of duty. . . ."

Again, the prototype of sainthood may be sought in the Stoic sage, according to E. Nourry ("P. Saintyves"), *Les Saints Successeurs des Dieux*, 1907, pp. 407 ff. For the culmination of this pagan development under Alexander Severus, see J. Réville, *La Religion à Rome sous les Sévères*, 1886, chap. 9, *La Réforme Ecclésiastique: Le Culte des Saints*, p. 276: ". . . Le trait caractéristique de cet éclectisme syncrétiste, c'est qu'il confond dans une même adoration mystique les dieux et les hommes, pour autant que ces derniers ont eu une nature spirituelle supérieure à celle du commun des mortels; c'est avant tout un culte des hommes divins, des héros, non pas des héros dans l'ordre politique ou militaire, mais de ceux qui se sont distingués parmi tous les autres par leur piété, leur élévation de sentiment, leur grandeur d'âme. Le syncrétisme tel que le conçoit et pratique Alexandre Sévère, c'est avant tout le culte des saints du paganisme." Cf. Lampridius, *Vita Alexandri Severi* (*Hist. Aug.* 18), 29, 2 and 31, 4 f.: ". . . Matutinis horis in larario suo, in quo et divos principes, sed optimos, electos et animas sanctiores, in quibus Apollonium et, quantum scriptor suorum temporum dicit, Christum, Abraham, et Orfeum et huiusce <modi ce> teros habebat ac maiorum effigies, rem divinam faciebat. . . . Vergilium autem Platonem poetarum vocabat eiusque imaginem cum Ciceronis simulacro in secundo larario habuit, ubi et Achillis et magnorum virorum, Alexandrum vero Magnum inter optimos et divos in larario maiore consecravit."

pla? — or did they seek for their ideals any sanction other than that of intrinsic worth? How did the influence of succeeding authors and movements of thought affect the situation? Can the idealization of a given character be traced as a development, and causes assigned? How did this development close? With the ascendancy of Christianity, the ancient models will naturally yield place to those of saints and martyrs: parallel with the fall of the gods of paganism is to be followed that of the objects of devotion consecrated in its ethical creed.<sup>1</sup>

An age which makes Morality elder sister to Religion,<sup>2</sup> might be expected, perhaps, to give no smaller measure of regard to deities whose worship, in Seneca's phrase, proceeds *non ture nec sertis, sed sudore et sanguine*,<sup>3</sup> than to the gods of the temples. Such, however, proves not to be the case. Scattered and desultory references in the more comprehensive works on Roman society, a cursory but emphatic notice in the *History of European Morals*,<sup>4</sup> isolated studies of the post-

<sup>1</sup> This article presents conclusions reached in a Latin doctor's dissertation and summarized in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 22 (1911), pp. 181 f. Its subject was suggested by Professor Clifford H. Moore, to whose friendly counsel my treatment is deeply indebted.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the well-known definition of Matthew Arnold; also E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, 1908, vol. 2, pp. 695 f.; W. Warde Fowler, *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero*, 1910, pp. 339 ff., and *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, 1911, pp. 226 ff. (see below, pp. 17 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> *Ep.* 67, 12; see below, pp. 21 f.

<sup>4</sup> Lecky, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 182 ff.: ". . . The circumstances of the Roman people tended inevitably to the production of a certain type of character, which, in its essential characteristics, was the type of Stoicism. . . . This fact derives a great importance from the large place which the biographical element occupied in ancient ethical teaching. Among Christians the ideals have commonly been either supernatural beings or men who were in constant connection with supernatural beings, and these men have usually been either Jews or saints, whose lives had been of such a nature as to isolate them from most human sympathies, and to efface as far as possible the national type. Among the Greeks and Romans the examples of virtue were usually their own fellow-countrymen; men who had lived in the same moral atmosphere, struggled for the same ends, acquired their reputation in the same spheres, exhibited in all their intensity the same national characteristics as their admirers. History had assumed a didactic character it has now almost wholly lost. One of the first tasks of every moralist was to collect traits of character illustrating the precepts he enforced. Valerius Maximus represented faithfully

humorous fame of a given historical figure<sup>1</sup> — scholarship mediaeval and modern affords no more.<sup>2</sup> Hopeless indeed is the quest, if one would look for the slightest recognition of this phase of Roman religion in technical treatises on the subject.<sup>3</sup> Modern research seems rather to vie with the pontifices in exhausting itself upon the nomenclature and attributes of lesser divinity — a thousand pages elucidating Vervactor, Imporcitor, Subruncinator, Panda Cela, Mutunus Tutunus, and their fellows, against one which recognizes the import of the personalities of Fabricius or Marius. In the almost always invaluable revision of Pauly, the investigator discovers under the caption *Exempla* only a reference to the book-trade.

A chief reason of modern writers' neglect may be recognized in the fact that no express definition or catalogue of the *exempla virtutis* has come down to us from the Romans themselves. So, it would seem, the term eluded notice. The fact of its currency is established by the briefest survey of their literature.

the method of the teachers of antiquity when he wrote his book giving a catalogue of different moral qualities, and illustrating each by a profusion of examples derived from the history of his own or of foreign nations. 'Whenever,' said Plutarch, 'we begin an enterprise, or take possession of a charge, or experience a calamity, we place before our eyes the example of the greatest men of our own or of bygone ages, and we ask ourselves how Plato or Epaminondas, Lycurgus or Agesilaus, would have acted. Looking into these personages as into a faithful mirror, we can remedy our defects in word or deed. . . . Whenever any perplexity arrives, or any passion disturbs the mind, the student of philosophy pictures to himself some of those who have been celebrated for their virtue, and the recollection sustains his tottering steps and prevents his fall.' Passages of this kind continually occur in the ancient moralists. . . ."

<sup>1</sup> E. g., the valuable articles by Münzer and others in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, s. vv. *Atilius*, *Curius*, *Fabricius*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> On the mediaeval exempla, see *The Exempla or Illustrative Stories from the Sermones Vulgares of Jacques de Vitry*, ed. T. F. Crane, London, 1890, preface, pp. 17-21, 70, 85 ff., 98 ff., and *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> Many students must, I cannot but think, have shared with me a keen disappointment and sense of lack in the most able discussions by scholars during the last twenty-five years. May the day come, and speedily, when such a treatment as that of the invaluable series on Roman religion and philosophy in Müller's *Handbuch*, without methodical recognition of a life beyond death or of deity as a power making for righteousness, shall be unthinkable!

Cicero is strikingly fond of appealing to the *exemplum*,<sup>1</sup> and more than once makes it his proud boast that he has himself by one or other of his achievements merited the title.<sup>2</sup>

The first to use the term *exempla* in a technical sense, as the designation of a recognized category, is, I think, Seneca, writing to Lucilius, in this case with special reference to the *exempla virtutum*.<sup>3</sup> "Dic tibi, ex istis, quae terribilia videntur, nihil est invictum. Singula vicere iam multi: ignem Mucius, crucem Regulus, venenum Socrates, exilium Rutilius, mortem ferro adactam Cato; et nos vincamus aliquid! Rursus ista, quae ut speciosa et felicia trahunt vulgum, a multis et saepe contempta sunt: Fabricius divitias imperator reiecit, censor notavit. Tubero paupertatem et se dignam et Capitolio iudicavit, cum fictilibus in publica cena usus ostendit debere iis hominem esse contentum quibus di etiam nunc uterentur. Honores reppulit pater Sextius, qui ita natus ut rem publicam deberet capessere, latum clavum divo Iulio dante non recepit; intellegebat enim quod dari posset, et eripi posse. Nos quoque aliquid et ipsi faciamus animose: simus inter exempla. Quare deficimus? quare desperamus? quicquid fieri potuit, potest. . . ."

<sup>1</sup> Or *exemplar*; but I fail to find a plural used of the class: cf. Cic. *Mur.* 66; *Sest.* 49; *Off.* 3, 16; *Tim.* 6; Sen. *Dial.* 2, 2, 1; 2, 7, 1. See below, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> E. g., *Sest.* 48-50: "Denique, cum omnia semper ad dignitatem rettulissem nec sine ea quicquam expetendum esse homini in vita putassem, mortem, quam etiam virgines Athenis regis, opinor, Erechthei filiae pro patria contempsisse dicuntur, ego vir consularis tantis rebus gestis timerem? praesertim cum eius essem civitatis ex qua C. Mucius solus in castra Porsennae venisset eumque interficere proposita sibi morte conatus esset; ex qua P. Decius primum pater, post aliquot annos patria virtute praeditus filius se ac vitam suam instructa acie pro salute populi Romani victoriaeque devovisset; ex qua innumerabiles alii partim adipiscendae laudis, partim vitandae turpitudinis causa mortem in variis bellis aequissimis animis oppetissent; in qua civitate ipse meminisset patrem huius M. Crassi, fortissimum virum, ne videret victorem vivus inimicum, eadem sibi manu vitam exhausisse qua mortem saepe hostibus optulisset. Haec ego et multa alia cogitans hoc videbam, si causam publicam mea mors peremisset, neminem umquam fore qui auderet suscipere contra improbos civis salutem rei publicae. Itaque, non solum si vi interissem, sed etiam si morbo extinctus essem, fore putabam ut exemplum rei publicae conservandae mecum simul interiret. . . . In qua quidem nunc me restituto vivit mecum simul exemplum fidei publicae. . . ." Cf. *Planc.* 90.

<sup>3</sup> *Ep.* 98, 12 ff.

From Seneca's time on, the expression seems to have been well established in Latin usage.<sup>1</sup> There is, however, to my knowledge, no passage in which the unmodified term *exempla* can be interpreted as referring specifically to *exempla virtutis*, except by inference from a context. Nor does it appear in the titles of the several books of exempla which have come down to us.<sup>2</sup> None of these, furthermore, concerns itself exclusively with moral examples, or even establishes any methodical, well marked division of contents in which they hold a separate and conspicuous place.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. e.g. Manil. 5, 450 ff.:

Sed regione means Cepheus umentis aquari  
non dabit in lusum mores; facit ora severae  
frontis et ad vultus componit pondere mentes.  
Pascentur curis veterumque exempla revolvant,  
semper et antiqui laudabunt verba Catonis. . . .

Sen. *Suas.* 6, 2: ". . . M. Cato, solus maximum vivendi moriendique exemplum, mori maluit quam rogare — nec erat Antonium rogaturus — et illas usque ad ultimum diem puras a civili sanguine manus in pectus sacerrimum armavit . . ." and *ibid.*, 7, 14 (see below, p. 67, n. 1); Solin. 1, 74: ". . . Pomponium poetam consularem virum numquam ructuasse habetur inter exempla; Antoniam Drusi non spuisse percelebre est . . ."; Aug. *Civ. Dei*, 5, 16 (rubric): "De mercede sanctorum civium civitatis aeternae, quibus utilia sunt Romanorum exempla virtutum"; Paul. Petr. *Vit. Mart.* 4 (61, 1038 D Migne):

. . . Dicite, qui spreti calcantes gaudia mundi  
abiecto vitam voluistis quaerere censu,  
quis nudum proprio textit nudatus amictu?  
quis quod ferre alium doluit, non ipse refugit?  
quis miser esse volens miserum miserando refecit?  
Vicisti veterum, Martine, exempla virorum,  
tuque ipsum: mirandus eras tum paupere tecto,  
vel cum divisiae remaneret portio vestis;  
cede tibi! antiquam geminasti hoc munere palmam. . . .

See also Donatus, cited below, p. 65, n. 5.

<sup>2</sup> E. g., Valerius Maximus' title, *Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium libri ix*; cf. however those of Nepos and Hyginus, below, p. 62, and Gell. 10, 18, 7: "Hyginus in Exempla refert. . . ."

<sup>3</sup> Lecky (above, p. 4, n. 4) gives a wrong impression of the composition of Valerius Maximus' book as a whole; see e.g. the opening chapters of Book 7: "De felicitate; sapienter dicta aut facta; vafre dicta aut facta; strategemata; de repulsis; de necessitate; de testamentis quae scissa sunt. . . ." Solinus, 1, 87-127, catalogues striking instances of *mensura*, *pernicitas*, *visus*, *fortitudo*, *memoria*, *mores*, *eloquentia*, *prudencia*, *pietas*, *pudicitia*, *felicitas*. Mutations of fortune, e.g., are especially likely to be lumped with genuine *exempla virtutis* by the ancient compilers.



Hence, in dealing with the *exempla virtutum moralium*<sup>1</sup> as a distinctive class, we are given no *a priori* definitions on which to rely. We have, therefore, independently to construct our own categories, first of the *virtutes morales*, then of the series of *exempla virtutum* itself. For these purposes what shall be our materials and methods of approach?

Among the systems of virtue current at Rome in antiquity, most familiar and significant, surely, is that of the Stoics, with the traditional heads *prudentia* (*sapientia*), *iustitia*, *fortitudo*, and *temperantia* (*modestia*).<sup>2</sup> Adoption of this as a standard *par excellence* for the purposes of the *exempla*, would perhaps be defensible.<sup>3</sup> Practically, however, I have found it a more satisfactory method to review carefully the passages of Latin authors in which ethical models are cited, and on that basis to determine which of the several virtues enforced by such citation should be classed as distinctively moral, and what relations exist between these.

It cannot, I think, be matter for much hesitation to decide that swift and impressive changes from high to low estate, or the reverse, as in the cases of Marius, Pompey, Lepidus, Antony, Agrippa, and others, however strong may have been their appeal to the ancient compilers as material for the citation of striking particular instances, have no claim on our consideration here, except in so far as they help to display attributes quite independent of them — the fortitude of Marius, the ill requited virtue of Pompey, the inconstancy of Antony. A glance at a case which does not involve such qualities, that of Lepidus, will help to convince one of this. On the other hand, modern prejudice may for a moment deter us from giving due weight to the disregard of omens by Claudius Pulcher, Flaminius, Terentius Varro; remembering we are to judge by Roman standards, and adjusting ourselves to the Roman point of view, we shall see such instances in

<sup>1</sup> For this word cf. Cic. *Fat.* 1: “. . . Quia pertinet ad mores, quod ἥθος illi vocant, nos eam partem philosophiae *de moribus* appellare solemus, sed decet augmentum linguam Latinam nominare *moralem*.” I use it to eliminate the wider application of *virtus*, which might otherwise be taken to include *prudentia*, etc., or even physical excellence.

<sup>2</sup> For variant subdivisions, see Cic. *Inv.* 2, 157 ff.; *Off.* 1, 15 ff.; Aug. *Divers. Quaest.* 31, 1 (40, 20 Migne) ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Lecky, *op. cit.*, above, p. 4, n. 4, and *passim*.

their true light as violations of *religio*, — of *pietas* toward the Gods and the Commonwealth.

It is harder to discriminate conclusively between the abstract *prudentia* (*sapientia*) and that distinctively moral excellence which displays itself in the individual's acts:<sup>1</sup> in the case of Laelius, for example, just how far shall the epithet *Sapiens* be taken to connote moral virtue? I have made the distinction as well as I could, while conscious of its inadequacy; disregarding Stoic predications of the inclusiveness of *sapientia*, I have given full weight to those passages only in which the *sapiens* is definitely credited with some particular moral quality or with moral excellence in general. The defects of this method are obvious; practically, however, I have not found much difficulty in its application.

Of the distinctively moral virtues, those most often enforced by exemplary citation appear to be:<sup>2</sup> *iustitia* (*aequitas*); *fides*; *pietas erga deos, patriam, parentes, ceteros*; *severitas* (*disciplina militaris*); *fortitudo*; *constantia* (*et in morte propinquorum*) = *patientia*; *continentia*; *paupertas* × *luxuria*; *clementia*; *moderatio* × *ambitio* (*petulantia*) — with their opposites, the less obvious of which I have indicated. Less frequently cited are *amicitia* (*concordia*); *gratia*; *observantia*; *gravitas*; *munificentia* (*liberalitas*) × *avaritia*. Some one of these qualities, and of these only, forms the theme of nearly every appeal to the *exemplum* in Latin authors.<sup>4</sup>

This is not a place to attempt the thankless task of establishing the order of their precedence — of determining, that is, which of several conflicting duties might claim a Roman's first allegiance. Of immense practical import, this question is seldom to be decided on general principles and without reference to the particular circumstances of a given case.<sup>5</sup> I shall here simply note, as bearing peculiarly upon our

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cic. *Off.* I, 15-17.

<sup>2</sup> These categories are, of course, not mutually exclusive. They stand approximately in the order of Cicero's classification (*l. c.*, *Off.* I, 15 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Warde Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, p. 412, and *passim*.

<sup>4</sup> See table, below, pp. 28 ff. All the *maiora* show *pietas* or *impietas erga patriam*.

<sup>5</sup> On the "conflict of duties" see Cic. *Off.* I, 152-161. Panaetius, whose book was the source of much of the *De Officiis*, had, according to Cicero, left this depart-

present inquiry, the great preponderance in Latin exemplary citation of the characteristically Roman appeal to patriotism.<sup>1</sup>

The power in republican and imperial Rome of the patriotic motive may, perhaps, often have been underestimated; the fact of its existence seems never to have been denied. It made a chief ground of the reproaches brought by the Fathers of the early Church against the pagan dispensation.<sup>2</sup> With the passing of feudalism, it became the inspiration and ideal of peoples who found in their own antecedents no impulse of like authority.<sup>3</sup> Nor are its causes far to seek. ". . . Character," says Lecky,<sup>4</sup> "usually determines opinion; it is not less true that character is itself in a great measure governed by national circumstances. . . . A great nation engaged in perpetual wars in an age when success in warfare depended neither upon wealth nor upon mechanical genius, but upon the constant energy of patriotic enthusiasm, and upon the unflinching maintenance of military discipline, the whole force of the national character tended to the production of a single definite type. . . . Patriotism and military honor were indissolubly connected in the Roman mind. They were the two sources of national enthusiasm, the chief ingredients of the national conception of greatness. . . . These influences were developed in Roman life to a degree which can now never be reproduced. War, for the reasons I have stated, was far more than at present the school of heroic virtues. Patriotism, in the absence of any strong theological passion, had assumed a transcendent power. . . . The state

ment of his subject untouched. Posidonius did something for it, and Cicero no doubt availed himself of his master's work. In a general way Cicero puts the claims of *iustitia* (social duty) first, above those of *fortitudo* and, with some exceptions, of *decorum*. For his gradation of social duties, see below, pp. 111 f.

<sup>1</sup> On patriotism at Rome, see Lecky, *op. cit.*, 1, ch. 2, esp. pp. 176 f., 181 ff., 186 f., 210 ff., 235 ff., 252 f.; M. Schneidewin, *Die antike Humanität*, 1897, pp. 209 ff., esp. 223 ff.; Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, 2, 175-179; J. B. Carter, *The Religious Life of Ancient Rome*, pp. 24 ff., 59.

In touching upon the general considerations preliminary to my subject, such as patriotism at Rome, the morality of the Roman gods, and the like, I have not attempted an exhaustive bibliography of these much discussed topics, but have aimed simply to suggest representative treatments.

<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 68, with n. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Westermarck, *op. cit.*, pp. 179 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 181-212, *passim*.

occupied in antiquity a prominence in the thoughts of men, which it has never attained in modern times. The influence of patriotism thrilled through every fibre of moral and intellectual life. . . . Patriotism almost always occupied a prominence in the scale of duties, which forms a striking contrast to the neglect or discredit into which it has fallen among modern teachers. We do indeed read of an Anaxagoras pointing to Heaven as to his true country, and pronouncing exile to be no evil, as the descent to the infernal regions is the same from every land; but such sentiments, though not unknown among the Epicureans<sup>1</sup> and the Cynics, were diametrically opposed to the prevailing tone. Patriotism was represented as a moral duty, and a duty of the highest order. Cicero only echoed the common opinion of antiquity in that noble passage, in which he asserts that the love we owe our country is even holier and more profound than that we owe our nearest kinsman, and that he can have no claim to the title of a good man who even hesitates to die in its behalf.<sup>2</sup>

"A necessary consequence of this prominence of patriotism was the practical character of most ancient ethics."

We shall later have occasion to revert, in a particular connection, to the pre-eminence over other moral duties of that of patriotism.<sup>3</sup> Already that pre-eminence meets us, clear and fully articulate, in Lucilius' characterization of *virtus* — 'true worth':<sup>4</sup>

. . . True worth, Albinus,  
Shall reckon eke our Country's welfare first,  
A parent's next, and third and last, thine own.

So Cicero, in the passage glanced at above,<sup>5</sup> and again: ". . . In ipsa autem communitate sunt gradus officiorum, ex quibus, quid

<sup>1</sup> Cf. below, p. 12, with n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Off.* 1, 57; see below, n. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Below, pp. 37 ff., 55.

<sup>4</sup> Lucil. *fr. incert.* 1326-1338 Marx (cf. his notes *ad loc.*, pp. 425 ff.):

. . . Virtus est homini . . .  
commoda praeterea patriae prima putare,  
deinde parentum, tertia iam postremaque nostra.

<sup>5</sup> *Off.* 1, 57 f. (above, p. 11): ". . . Omnium societatum nulla est gravior, nulla carior quam ea quae cum re publica est uni cuique nostrum. Cari sunt parentes, cari liberi, propinqui, familiares, sed omnes omnium caritates patria una complexa est, pro qua quis bonus dubitet mortem oppetere, si ei sit profuturus? Quo est detestabilior istorum inmanitas qui lacerarunt omni scelere patriam et in ea fundi-

cuique praestet, intellegi possit, ut prima dis immortalibus, secunda patriae, tertia parentibus, deinceps gradatim reliquis debeantur.”<sup>1</sup>

A different point of view is interestingly indicated by the program of Epicureanism which Cicero puts in the mouth of Piso:<sup>2</sup> “Laudabat homo doctus philosophos nescio quos . . . qui dicuntur praeter ceteros esse auctores et laudatores voluptatis . . . eosdemque praeclare dicere aiebat sapientis omnia sua causa facere, rem publicam capessere hominem bene sanum non oportere, nihil esse praestabilius otiosa vita plena et conferta voluptatibus; eos autem qui dicerent dignitati esse serviendum, rei publicae consulendum, officii rationem in omni vita, non commodi esse ducendam, adeunda pro patria pericula, volnera excipienda, mortem oppetendam, vaticinari atque insanire dicebat.” In general it may be noted that the philosopher’s independence of country and home tended to minimize for him the patriotic impulse; most markedly — as Cicero makes plain — in the case of the Epicureans: Lucretius shows himself of all Roman poets least sensible to the martial glories of Rome.<sup>3</sup>

tus delenda occupati et sunt et fuerunt. Sed si contentio quaedam et comparatio fiat, quibus plurimum tribuendum sit officii, principes sint patria et parentes, quorum beneficiis maximis obligati sumus, proximi liberi totaque domus, quae spectat in nos solos neque aliud ullum potest habere perfugium, deinceps bene convenientes propinqui, quibuscum communis etiam fortuna plerumque est. . . .”

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* 1, 160; cf. 3, 28, and *Somm. Scip.* 9, 2–3 (*Rep.* 6, 29 Müller): “Sunt autem optimae curae de salute patriae,” and *Macr. ad loc., Comm.* 2, 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Sest.* 23; cf. on the other hand *Verg. Ecl.* 4, 26 ff.:

At simul heroum laudes et facta parentis  
iam legere et quae sit poteris cognoscere virtus,  
molli paulatim flavescet campus arista. . . .

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J. S. Reid, *Lucretiana*, in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 22 (1911), p. 1, on *Lucr.* 1, 28: “. . . Of all schools of ancient thought, the Epicurean alone was untouched by the glamour of war. Cicero makes it a reproach to the disciples of Epicurus that their discourses were not embellished by references to the warriors of old. And Lucretius is the one Roman poet whose soul is wholly unstirred by the martial history of his own country. . . .” Lucretius’ sole allusion to the Heroes appears in 3, 1025 ff.:

. . . Lumina sis oculis etiam bonus Ancus reliquit,  
qui multis melior quam tu fuit, improbe, rebus. . . .  
Scipiades, belli fulmen, Carthaginis horror,  
ossa dedit terrae, proinde ac famul infimus esset. . . .

The standard of cosmopolitanism<sup>1</sup> raised by philosophy was taken up by Christianity,<sup>2</sup> to find its noblest expression after ten centuries in Sapia's reply to Dante witnessing the punishment of Envy in the second terrace of the purgatory:<sup>3</sup>

"Ditemi, chè mi fia grazioso e caro,  
S'anima è qui tra voi che sia latina;  
E forse a lei sarà buon, s'io l'apparo." —  
"O frate mio, ciascuna è cittadina  
D'una vera città; ma tu vuoi dire  
Che dovesse in Italia peregrina."

Yet amid polemic and detraction, amid material corruption and disaster, for centuries the ancient cult of patriotism subsisted. Vainly did philosophy convict it of illogical altruism, vainly did Christianity seek to pale the glories of the terrestrial by depicting those of the heavenly fatherland. In the last century of the Western Empire appears in the pages of Claudian the most precise statement of the "conflict of duties," the clearest practical application of Cicero's principle, to be found — I venture to say — in the entire range of Roman literature. The proud distinction of Honorius is, says Clau-

<sup>1</sup> For this movement at Rome, cf. S. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 1905, pp. 326 ff.; Westermarck, *op. cit.*, 2, 176-179; Carter, *The Religious Life of Ancient Rome*, pp. 78 ff.; R. D. Hicks, *Stoic and Epicurean*, 1910, pp. 140 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. e.g. Lactantius' criticism of the precept of Lucilius, *Inst.* 6, 18 ff.: "*Commoda praelerea patriae prima putare sublata hominum discordia nihil est omnino. Quae sunt enim patriae commoda nisi alterius civitatis aut gentis incommoda, id est, fines propagare aliis violenter ereptos, augere imperium, vectigalia facere maiora? quae omnia non utique virtutes, sed virtutum sunt eversiones. . . . Verum est enim Ciceronis illud . . . nam quomodo potest iustus esse qui nocet, qui odit, qui spoliat, qui occidit? quae omnia faciunt qui patriae prodesse nituntur. . . . Ergo . . . iis qui iusti habiti sunt, adempta iustitia est. . . .*" Lactantius, citing Cicero, has reference to *Off.* 3, 28: ". . . Qui autem civium rationem dicunt habendam, externorum negant, ii dirimunt communem humani generis societatem; qua sublata beneficentia, liberalitas, bonitas, iustitia funditus tollitur; quae qui tollunt, etiam adversus deos immortales impii iudicandi sunt. Ab iis enim constitutam inter homines societatem evertunt, cuius societatis artissimum vinculum est magis arbitrari esse contra naturam hominem homini detrudere sui commodi causa quam omnia incommoda subire. . . ." See also Ausonius, p. 21, 1 Peiper (below, p. 14, n. 3, *ad fin.*).

<sup>3</sup> *Purg.* 13, 91 ff.

dian,<sup>1</sup> that unlike Augustus, his vengeance for his parent wrought no misfortune, but rather benefit, to his country:

Ense Thyestiadae poenas exegit Orestes,  
sed mixtum pietate nefas, dubitandaque caedis  
gloria, materno laudem cum crimine pensat;  
pavit Iuleos invisio sanguine manes  
Augustus, sed falsa pii praeconia sumpsit  
in luctum patriae civili strage parentans:  
at tibi causa patris rerum coniuncta saluti  
bellorum duplicat laurus, isdemque tropaeis  
reddita libertas orbi, vindicta parenti.

A singular coincidence had made the most definite enforcement of the patriotic canon almost its last. "With the fall of the Western Empire," says Westermarck,<sup>2</sup> "patriotism died out in Europe, and remained extinct for centuries."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 28, 113 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, 2, p. 179 (above, p. 13, n. 1).

<sup>3</sup> For some interesting indications as to the rank in the scale of social duties accorded to patriotism by public opinion among the Greeks, see Pyth. *Carm. Aur.* 1 ff.:

Ἀθανάτους μὲν πρῶτα θεοὺς, νόμῳ ὥς διὰ κενταί,  
τίμα, καὶ σέβου ὄρκον, ἔπειθ' ἥρωας ἀγαυοὺς,  
τοὺς τε καταχθονίους σέβει δαίμονας ἔννομα βέζων,  
τοὺς τε γονεῖς τίμα, τοὺς τ' ἄγχιστ' ἐκγεγαῶτας·  
τῶν δ' ἄλλων ἀρετῇ ποιεῖ φίλον, ὅστις ἄριστος.

Eur. fr. 853 Nauck<sup>2</sup> (p. 638, *incertarum*), cited among other important passages by Marx on Lucilius, 1904, p. 427:

Τρεῖς εἰσὶν ἀρεταὶ τὰς χρεῶν σ' ἀσκεῖν, τέκνον,  
θεοὺς τε τιμᾶν τοὺς τε φύσαντας γονεῖς  
νομοὺς τε κοινούς 'Ελλάδος· καὶ ταῦτα δρῶν  
κάλλιστον ἔξεις στέφανον εὐκλείας ἀεί.

Stob. *Aniologium*, ed. Wachsmuth and Hense, 1909, 4, 25, *passim*, esp. 45: Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοξένου Πυθαγορικῶν ἀποφάσεων· Μετὰ τὸ θεῖον καὶ δαιμόνιον πλείστον ποιεῖσθαι λόγον γονέων τε καὶ νόμων μὴ πλαστῶς, ἀλλὰ πεπιστευμένως ἑαυτὸν πρὸς ταῦτα παρασκευάζοντα. τὸ μένιν <ἐν> τοῖς πατρίοις θεοῖς τε καὶ νόμοις ἐδοκίμαζον, εἰ καὶ μικρῷ χεῖρῳ τῶν ἑτέρων εἴη. Contrast the following, from a late Imperial writer, *ibid.*, 53: Ἱεροκλέους ἐκ τοῦ Πῶς χρηστὸν τοῖς γονεῦσιν· Μετὰ τὸν περὶ θεῶν καὶ πατρίδος λόγον τίνος μᾶλλον ἂν προσώπου μνησθεῖη τις πρῶτον ἢ γονέων; ὁθεν λεκτέον περὶ τούτων, οὐδὲ δευτέρους καὶ ἐπιγείους τινὰς θεοὺς εἰπὼν οὐκ <ἂν> ἀμάρτοι τις ἕνεκά γε τῆς ἐγγύτητος, εἰ θέμις εἰπεῖν, καὶ θεῶν ἡμῖν τιμωτέρους. Cf. for the reverse change of emphasis Phaedr. app. 6, p. 127 Hau.:

"Audite gentes Delii monitus dei:  
pietatem colite, vota superis reddite,  
patriam, parentes, natos, castas coniuges  
defendite armis. . . ."

Among the *exempla virtutis* cited by Roman writers we shall naturally, in the light of the facts just set forth, expect those conspicuous for devotion to country to be most stressed.<sup>1</sup> And as naturally we shall expect most of these examples to be native Romans. To a study of the significance of this class of moral instances, as the most vital and interesting, I shall in the following pages, from considerations of space, limit the discussion.<sup>2</sup> Not that the later Romans, at least, showed themselves incapable of appreciating the achievements of the men of Marathon, of such patriots as Codrus, Menoeceus, Pericles, Epaminondas. Quite otherwise.<sup>3</sup> In urging Romans to self-sacrifice

with Auson. *Epicedion in Patrem*, p. 21, 1 Peiper: "Post deum semper patrem colui secundamque reverentiam genitori meo debui. Sequitur ergo hanc summi dei venerationem epicedion patris mei. . . ." See also R. Heinze, *Virgils Epische Technik*, 1903, p. 473, with n. 1: ". . . Achill wünscht statt des schmählichen Todes im Wasser den von der Hand des tapfersten Mannes; der Imitator der Odyssee sagt vergrößernd τῷ κ' ἑλαχὼν κτερέων καὶ μὲν κλέος ἦγον Ἀχαιοί. Aus Aeneas's Worten *quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis contigit oppellere* hört jeder das *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* heraus, das in dem *οὐ τὸτ' ὄλοντο Τροίη ἐν εὐρείῃ* der Odyssee nicht liegen kann."

<sup>1</sup> Above, p. 9, n. 4.

<sup>2</sup> I include distinguished *hostes*, as *exempla* virtually "national" for the Roman; see below, pp. 25 f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Cicero, cited below, p. 27. The narrow Roman pride manifests itself, naturally, in this connection as elsewhere: cf. *ibid.*, cited below, p. 47; Liv. *praef.* 10 f.: "Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in illustri posita monumento intueri, inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu, foedum exitu quod vites. Ceterum aut me amor negotii suscepti fallit, aut nulla umquam res publica nec maior nec sanctior nec bonis exemplis ditior fuit, nec in quam civitatem tam serae avaritia luxuriaque immigraverint, nec ubi tantus ac tam diu paupertati ac parsimoniae honos fuerit; adeo quanto rerum minus, tanto minus cupiditatis erat." So Plin. *H.N.* 7, 40: ". . . Gentium in toto orbe praestantissima una omnium virtute haud dubie Romana exstitit. Felicitas cui praecipua fuerit homini non est humani iudicii. . . ." Quint. *Inst.* 12, 2, 30: "Antiquitus dicta et facta praeclare . . . nusquam plura maioraque quam in nostrae civitatis monumentis reperientur. An fortitudinem, iustitiam, fidem, continentiam, frugalitatem, contemptum doloris ac mortis melius alii docebunt quam Fabricii, Curii, Reguli, Decii, Mucii, aliique innumerabiles? quantum enim Graeci praeceptis valent, tantum Romani — quod est maius — exemplis." Florus, *de Qualitate Vitae*, 43, 417, *ap.* Bähr. *P L M* 4, 347:

"Sperne mores transmarinos, mille habent officia.

Cive Romano per orbem nemo vivit rectius;

quippe malim unum Catonem quam trecentos Socratas."



for Rome, the most potent arguments, naturally, will have been instances of devotion to the same cause. A further reason, moreover, for the greater prevalence of native exempla in Roman as compared with modern ethics, must be sought in the character of the Roman religion.

The sources of moral instances appear to be threefold. God in human likeness may be clothed with moral attributes, and an approach to His excellence may be enjoined upon mankind. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."<sup>1</sup> Or the instance may take rise, if not in deity itself, in some being to whom a greater or less degree of divinity is ascribed, whether by informal consensus or by decree of church or state.<sup>2</sup> The divine nature accredited to such ideals would seemingly tend to remove them beyond the sphere of imitation; as a matter of fact, the great majority of writers appear unconscious of such a restriction.<sup>3</sup>

There is probably no more perilous topic for dogmatic assertion than that which raises the question of the morality or unmorality of the Roman gods.<sup>4</sup> Conceptions of these were manifold and changing

Macrob. *Comm.* 2, 17, 8 f.: ". . . Romulus nobis in primo genere ponatur, cuius vita virtutes numquam deseruit, semper exercuit; in secundo Pythagoras, qui agendi nescius fuit, artifex disserendi, et solas doctrinae et conscientiae virtutes secutus est; sit in tertio ac mixto genere apud Graecos Lycurgus et Solon, inter Romanos Numa, Catones ambo, multique alii, qui et philosophiam hauserunt altius, et firmamentum rei publicae praestiterunt: soli enim sapientiae otio deditos ut abunde Graecia tulit, ita Roma nescivit. Quoniam igitur Africanus noster, quem modo avus praeceptor instituit, ex illo genere est quod et de doctrina vivendi regulam mutuatur et statum publicum virtutibus fulcit, ideo ei perfectionis geminae praecepta mandantur." On a chief conceit of the Romans', that of their national *fides*, see Westermarck, *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, 2, p. 96, with Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, 5, 311, there cited.

For a similar — and perhaps a more pronounced — attitude among the Greeks, cf. Tacitus, cited below, p. 60.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. 5, 48.

<sup>2</sup> Heracles, Aeneas, Romulus, Jesus, Augustus and succeeding emperors, are familiar cases.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. below, pp. 24, 48 f.

<sup>4</sup> On this point see Lecky, *op. cit.*, 1, 169–180 and 357–360; C. Martha, *Les Moralistes sous l'Empire romain*, 1866<sup>3</sup>, pp. 1 f.; Westermarck, *op. cit.*, 2, 713–717, 731 ff.; Warde Fowler, *Religious Experience*, pp. 7, 226–228 (with notes), 357–379; T. G. Tucker, *Life in the Roman World of Nero and Saint Paul*, 1910, pp. 377 ff. For the general topic, see W. Wundt, *Ethik*, 1903<sup>2</sup>, part 1, ch. 2.

— for the Romans themselves, deeply coloured by Greek notions. Naturally the question centres, for the historical period, upon the religion of the State. “At Rome,” says Warde Fowler,<sup>1</sup> “though the earliest traces and traditions of law show a certain consecration of morality, inasmuch as the criminal is made over as a kind of propitiatory sacrifice to the deity whom he has offended, yet in the ordinary course of life, so far as I can discern, the individual was left very much where he was, before the State arose, in his relation to the Divine. In no other ancient State that we know of did the citizen so entirely resign the regulation of all his dealings with the State’s gods to the constituted authorities set over him. . . . It would be

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 226–471, *passim*; cf. Lecky, *op. cit.*, I, 169–359, *passim*: “One of the first facts that must strike a student who examines the ethical teaching of the ancient civilisations is how imperfectly that teaching was represented, and how feebly it was influenced by the popular creed. The moral ideals had at no time been sought in the actions of the gods, and long before the triumph of Christianity, polytheism had ceased to have any great influence upon the more cultivated intellects of mankind. . . . The Roman religion, even in its best days, though an admirable system of moral discipline, was never an independent source of moral enthusiasm. It was the creature of the State, and derived its inspiration from political feeling. The Roman gods were not, like those of the Greeks, the creations of an unbridled and irreverent fancy, nor, like those of the Egyptians, representations of the forces of nature [*sic*]; they were for the most part simple allegories, frigid personifications of different virtues, or presiding spirits imagined for the protection of different departments of industry. . . . Juxtaposition of many forms of worship effected what could not have been effected by the most sceptical literature or the most audacious philosophy. The moral influence of religion was completely annihilated. . . . The idea of sanctity was so far removed from the popular divinities, that it became a continual complaint that prayers were offered which the most depraved would blush to pronounce aloud. Amid the corruption of the empire, we meet with many noble efforts of reform made by philosophers or by emperors, but we find not a trace of the moral influence of the old religion. The apotheosis of the emperors consummated its degradation. The foreign gods were identified with those of Rome, and all their immoral legends associated with the national creed. . . . Except perhaps among the peasants in the country districts, the Roman religion, in the last years of the republic, and in the first century of the empire, scarcely existed, except in the state of a superstition, and he who would examine the true moral influences of the time must turn to the great schools of philosophy which had been imported from Greece. . . . In the stoical period of the Roman Empire, the positive religion had come to be regarded as merely an art for obtaining preternatural assistance in the affairs of life, and the moral amelioration of mankind was deemed altogether external to its sphere. . . .”

an interesting inquiry, if the material for an answer were available, to try and discover how this gradual absorption of religion (or rather religious duties) by the State and its authorities affected the morality of the individual Roman. . . . Religion and morality are really elemental instincts of human nature, primarily undistinguishable from each other; and if that be so, then the over-elaboration of either the moral or religious law, or of the two combined, will tend to weaken the binding force of both. If, as at Rome, the citizen is made perfectly comfortable in his relations with the Power manifesting itself in the universe, owing to the complete mastery of the *ius divinum* by the State and its officials, there will assuredly be a tendency to paralyse the elemental religious impulse, and with it, if I am not mistaken, the elemental sense of right and wrong. . . . The farthest we can go in ascribing a moral influence to the State religion is in giving it credit for helping to maintain that sense of law and order which served to keep the life of the family sound and wholesome. . . . When the craving did at last come upon the Roman, which in times of doubt and peril has come upon individuals and communities in all ages, for support and comfort from the Unseen, it had to be satisfied by giving him new gods to worship in new ways — aliens with whom he had nothing in common, who had no home in his patriotic feeling, no place in his religious experience. . . . He was destitute in regard to his sense of duty, which had been largely dependent on religion, both in the family and in the State. . . . Much more was wanted than a bond sanctioned by civil and religious law; there was needed a sense of duty to the family, the slave, the provincials, the poor and unfortunate. There was no spring of moral action, no religious consecration of morality, no stimulus to moral endeavour. . . . For the Roman's destitution in regard to God Epicurism could find no remedy, and as a consequence it could provide no religious sanction for his conduct in life. . . . There had been nothing in the religion of Rome, or any other city-state, to make it inevitable, reasonable, that man should worship the Power, except tradition and self-interest, involved in the tradition and self-interest of the family and the city. . . . The idea of conforming his life to the will of any of these *numina* would, of course, be absolutely strange to him — the expression would have no meaning whatever for him. The help which he sought

from them was not moral help, but material. . . . In the religious system we have been occupied with, religion can only be reckoned as one of the factors in the growth of morality; it supplied the sanction for some acts of righteousness, but (in historical times at least) by no means for all." Again:<sup>1</sup> "It is characteristic of the Roman that he should think . . . rather of the law of his State than of the morality of the individual, as emanating from that Right Reason to which he might give the name of Jupiter: I have been unable to find a passage in which Cicero attributes to this deity the sanction for individual goodness, though there are many that assert the belief that justice and the whole system of social life depend on the gods and our belief in them. But the Roman had never been conscious of individual duty, except in relation to his State, or to the family, which was a living cell in the organism of the State."<sup>2</sup> In his eyes law was rather the source of morality than morality the cause and the reason of law; and as his religion was a part of the law of his State, and thus had but an indirect connection with morality, it would not naturally occur to him that even the great Jupiter himself, thus glorified as the Reason in the universe, could really help him in the conduct of his life *qua* individual. It is only as the source of legalised morality that we can think of Varro's Jupiter as 'making for righteousness.' "

That the Romans, throughout the historical period, recognized and strove hard to remedy a defect innate in their ancestral religious system, is evidenced on every hand. The ancient divinities were made to denounce the moral vices, and themselves endowed, more or less successfully, with moral attributes. The creation of supplementary deities, purely moral, Fides, Concordia, Pudicitia, and the like — a phenomenon too familiar to need more than passing mention — is perhaps testimony at once to the original incompetency in this respect of the elder divinities, and to the inadequate success of the Roman state in their reformation.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Social Life*, pp. 340 f.

<sup>2</sup> For individualism at Rome, see Warde Fowler, *Religious Experience*, pp. 340 ff., 411 f.; Carter, *The Religious Life of Ancient Rome*, pp. 72 ff., 82 ff.; C. H. Moore, *Individualism and Religion in the Early Roman Empire*, in *The Harvard Theological Review*, 2 (1909), pp. 221 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Plin. *H. N.* 2, 7, 14 f.: ". . . Quapropter effigiem dei formamque quaerere inbecillitatis humanae reor. Quisquis est deus, si modo est alius [sc. praeter solem],

The stress laid on the Exempla themselves was thus pretty certainly the result of a further attempt, at first perhaps largely unconscious, in the same direction.<sup>1</sup> Their function, however, was sooner or later

et quacumque in parte, totus est sensus, totus visus, totus auditus, totus animae, totus animi, totus sui. Innumeros quidem credere atque etiam ex vitiis hominum, ut Pudicitiam Concordiam Mentem Spem Honorem Clementiam Fidem aut (ut Democrito placuit) duos omnino Poenam et Beneficium maiorem ad socordiam accedit. Fragilis et laboriosa mortalitas in partes ista digessit infirmitatis suae memor, ut portionibus coleret quisque quo maxime indigeret. . . ." See Warde Fowler, *op. cit.*, p. 285, with notes; H. L. Axtell, *The Deification of Abstract Ideas in Roman Literature and Inscriptions*, 1907, esp. pp. 62 ff., with 80, n. Cf. Aug. Civ. Dei, 4, 20, *De Virtute et Fide, quas pagani templis et sacris honoraverunt praetermittentes alia bona, quae similiter colenda fuerunt, si recte illis divinitas tribuatur*: ". . . Cur temperantia dea esse non meruit, cum eius nomine nonnulli Romani principes non parvam gloriam compararint? Cur denique fortitudo dea non est, quae adfuit Mucio, cum dexteram porrexit in flammam; quae adfuit Curtio, cum se pro patria in abruptam terram praecipitem dedit; quae adfuit Decio patri et Decio filio, cum pro exercitu se voverunt? Si tamen his omnibus vera inerat fortitudo, unde modo non agitur. Quare prudentia, quare sapientia nulla numinum loca meruerunt? An quia in nomine generali ipsius virtutis omnes coluntur? Sic ergo posset et unus Deus coli, cuius partes ceteri dii putantur. Sed in illa una virtute et fides est et pudicitia, quae tamen extra in aedibus propriis altaria meruerunt."

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Warde Fowler, *Social Life*, p. 331: ". . . The doctrine of Lucretius . . . apart from its literary greatness . . . has incidentally a lasting value for all students of religious history, as showing better than anything else that has survived from that age the need of a real consecration of morality by the life and example of a Divine man. . . ." So Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 621: ". . . The world needed more than a great physical force to assuage its cravings; it demanded a moral God, Who could raise before the eyes of men a moral ideal, and support them in striving to attain it. . . ." *Ibid.*, pp. 404 ff.: ". . . We can imagine Plutarch looking down the quiet street in the still vacant noontide, as he sat trying to revive the ancient glories of his race, and to match them with their conquerors, while he reminded the lords of the world, who, in Plutarch's early youth, seemed to be wildly squandering their heritage, of the stern, simple virtue by which it had been won. For in the Lives of great Greeks and Romans, the moral interest is the most prominent. . . . Plutarch was before all else a moralist, with a genius for religion. His ethical treatises deserve to be thoroughly explored, and as sympathetically expounded, for the light which they throw on the moral aspirations of the age. . . . Of high moral ideals, sincere piety, and absorbing interest in the fate of human character . . . what nobler task could a man set himself than to attempt to give some practical guidance to a generation conscious of moral weakness, and distracted between new

thoroughly realized, and its continued importance — in spite of all that Roman priestcraft could devise — is recognized by so late a writer, for example, as the younger Seneca.<sup>1</sup> At the close of a long passage notable for disparagement of the Gods and extravagant laudation of the Exempla, "Sunt quaedam tristes," he exclaims,<sup>2</sup> "vultus bona. Sunt quaedam vota quae non gratulantium coetu, sed adorantium venerantiumque celebrantur. Ita tu non putas Regulum optasse ut

spiritual ideals and the mythologies of the past? The urgent need for moral culture and reform of character, for a guiding force in conduct, was profoundly felt by all the great serious minds of the Flavian age, by Pliny and Tacitus, by Juvenal and Quintilian. But Plutarch probably felt it more acutely than any, and took endless pains to satisfy it. . . ." Warde Fowler, *Religious Experience*, p. 466, thus comments on the contribution of Christianity to Roman ethics: "Whereas the connection between religion and morality has so far been a loose one, — at Rome, indeed, so loose, that many have refused to believe in its existence, — the new religion was itself morality, but morality consecrated and raised to a higher power than it had ever yet reached. It becomes active instead of passive; mere good nature is replaced by a doctrine of universal love; *pietas*, the sense of duty in outward things, becomes an enthusiasm embracing all humanity, consecrated by such an appeal to the conscience as there never had been in the world before — the appeal to the life and death of the divine Master. . . ." The whole passage should be read in this connection, with careful attention to the notes. Cf. Wundt, *Ethik*, part 1, ch. 2, 2a, pp. 68 f., and 2d, pp. 83 ff.; C. B. Gulick, *The Rendering of the Homeric Hymns*, in *Anniversary Papers by Colleagues and Pupils of George Lyman Kittredge*, 1913, p. 162.

<sup>1</sup> Contemporary pronouncements might be multiplied, as well from pagan as from Christian writers, illustrating the immorality of the Gods. I will cite only such as bear directly on their use as exempla.

<sup>2</sup> *Ep.* 67, 11 ff.; cf. *ibid.*, 11, 8 ff.: "Iam clausulam epistula poscit. Accipe, <et>quidem utilem ac salutarem, quam te adfingere animo volo: 'Aliquis vir bonus nobis eligendus est, ac semper ante oculos habendus, ut sic tamquam illo spectante vivamus, et omnia tamquam illo vidente faciamus.' Hoc, mi Lucili, Epicurus praecepit. Custodem nobis et paedagogum dedit, nec inmerito; magna pars peccatorum tollitur, si peccaturis testis adsistit. Aliquem habeat animus quem vereatur, cuius auctoritate etiam secretum suum sanctius faciat. O felicem illum, qui non praesens tantum sed etiam cogitatus emendat! O felicem, qui sic aliquem vereri potest ut ad memoriam quoque eius se conponat atque ordinet! qui sic aliquem vereri potest, cito erit verendus. Elige itaque Catonem; si hic tibi videtur nimis rigidus, elige remissioris animi virum Laelium. Elige eum cuius tibi placuit et vita et oratio et ipse animum ante [se] ferens vultus; illum tibi semper ostende vel custodem vel exemplum. Opus est, inquam, aliquo ad quem mores nostri se ipsi exigant; nisi ad regulam prava non corriges." See Martha, *Les Moralistes*, pp. 44 ff.; W. L. Davidson, *The Stoic Creed*, 1907, pp. 184 ff.

ad Poenos perveniret? Indue magni viri animum et ab opinionibus volgi secede paulisper! Cape, quantam debes, virtutis pulcherrimae ac magnificentissimae speciem, quae nobis non ture nec sertis, sed sudore et sanguine colenda est. Adspice M. Catonem. . . .<sup>1</sup> On this point St. Augustine not unnaturally puts yet greater stress. One of the letters has a severe arraignment of acts of immorality ascribed by the Romans to the ancient divinities. If the Gods are guilty of immoral acts, runs the argument, of what avail against such practices are prohibitions issued in their name? *Si Catonem maluisset imitari quam Iovem!* — ‘It is safer to imitate Cato than Jupiter. . . . Wherefore also not without prudence did the wise rulers of the Republic or earthly State, after they were assured of its present welfare, provide as follows for its preservation and maintenance. They set before its younger members for imitation, not their Gods, but men, pre-eminent as they thought in respect of virtue, and worthy of all praise. Whereas concerning the Gods their testimony is to this effect unanimous, that bad men are made the worse for imitation of them; so unmistakable are their vices and immoralities.’<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ambros. *Ep.* 1, 18, 7 ff. (16, 973 B Migne): “. . . Roma . . . aliis . . . eos interpellat vocibus: ‘Quid me casso quotidie gregis innoxii sanguine cruentatis? Non in fibris pecudum, sed in viribus bellatorum tropaea victoriae sunt. Aliis ego disciplinis orbem subegi. Militabat Camillus, qui sublata Capitolio signa, caesis Tarpeiae rupis triumphatoribus, reportavit: stravit virtus quos religio non removet. Quid de Atilio loquar, qui militiam etiam mortis impendit? Africanus non inter Capitolii aras, sed inter Hannibalis acies triumphum invenit. Quid mihi veterum exempla profertis? odi ritus Neronum. . . .’” So Prud. *c. Symm.* 2, 553 ff.:

“ . . . Detrahit invictis legionibus et sua Romae  
praemia diminuit, qui, quidquid fortiter actum est,  
adscribit Veneri, palmam victoribus aufert.  
Frustra igitur currus summo miramur in arcu  
quadriugos stantesque duces in curribus altis  
Fabricios, Curios, hinc Drusos, inde Camillos . . .  
si Brennum, Antiochum, Persen, Pyrrhum, Mithridatem  
Flora, Matuta, Ceres, et Larentina subegit. . . .  
Quid sibi vult virtus, quid gloria, si Corvinum  
corvus Apollineus penna vel gutture iuvit?  
. . . Video quae te moveant exempla vetustae  
virtutis. . . .”

On the moral inefficacy of Stoicism, see Warde Fowler, *Religious Experience*, pp. 372 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Ep.* 91, 4-5 (33, 314-315 Migne): “. . . Denique illi doctissimi viri qui rem publicam civitatemque terrenam, qualis eis esse debere videbatur, magis domesticis

With due allowance for the vehemence of polemic, it is, nevertheless, perhaps clear that Roman moralists lacked the fund of purely divine examples which a modern writer enjoys. The frequency of their appeal to examples of human origin will, therefore, be correspondingly increased. Now modern literatures, in their use of this class of examples, are influenced by a state of affairs which finds little or no counterpart in ancient Rome, even under the Empire. With them, the presence of religious faiths not native to the soil has made natural, and almost obligatory, the use of instances imported from a foreign society. "Among Christians the ideals have commonly been either supernatural beings or men who were in constant connection with supernatural beings, and these men have usually been either Jews or saints, whose lives had been of such a nature as to isolate them from most human sympathies, and to efface as far as possible the national type."<sup>1</sup> In a society which exalts Washington and all but deifies

disputationibus requirebant, vel etiam describebant, quam publicis actionibus instituebant atque formabant, egregios atque laudabiles, quos putabant, homines potius quam deos suos imitandos proponebant erudiendae indoli iuventutis. Et revera Terentianus ille adulescens (*Eun.* 583 ff.) qui spectans tabulam pictam in pariete, ubi pictura inerat de adulterio regis deorum, libidinem qua rapiebatur stimulis etiam tantae auctoritatis accendit, nullo modo in illud flagitium vel concupiscendo laberetur vel perpetrando immergeretur, si Catonem maluisset imitari quam Iovem; sed quo pacto id faceret, cum in templis adorare cogeretur Iovem potius quam Catonem? Verum haec ex comoedia, quibus impiorum luxur et sacrilega superstitio convinceretur, proferre forsitan non debemus. Lege vel recole, in eisdem libris quam prudenter disseratur nullo modo potuisse scriptiones et actiones recipi comoediarum, nisi mores recipientium consonarent; ita clarissimorum virorum in re publica excellentium et de re publica disputantium auctoritate firmatur nequissimos homines fieri deorum imitatione peiores, non sane verorum, sed falsorum atque fictorum. . . . Quaeso te, siccine caecum est humanum genus adversus veritatem ut tam aperta et manifesta non sentiat? tot locis pingitur funditur tunditur sculpsitur scribitur legitur agitur cantatur saltatur Iuppiter adulteria tanta committens; quantum erat ut in suo saltem Capitolio ista prohibens legeretur? . . ." Cf. *Civ. Dei*, 1, 32: ". . . Adverte, qui adversus liberatorem a talibus dominis murmuratis: ludi scaenici, spectacula turpitudinum et licentia vanitatum, non hominum vitiis, sed deorum vestrorum iussis Romae instituti sunt. Tolerabilius divinos honores deferretis illi Scipioni quam deos huius modi coleretis. Neque enim erant illi dii suo pontifice meliores. . . ." See further *ibid.*, 2, 4 ff., esp. 7, 12, and 22.

<sup>1</sup> Lecky, *op. cit.*, 1, p. 183 (above, p. 4, n. 4). Contrast the widely different spirit motiving the proud assertions that 'Rome is rich in examples'; above, p. 15, n. 3.



Lincoln, the casuist is yet trained almost instinctively to ask himself, not "What would Washington or Lincoln do in the given situation?" but "What would Jesus do? or St. Paul?" This will doubtless be even more the case under other than republican governments, which seem to be the natural nursery of exempla.<sup>1</sup> Quite different were conditions at Rome. There, on the other hand, even in Imperial times, the influx of cults not native brought with it instances few or none. We have described the old religion as unmoral: the character of the new cults, with few exceptions,<sup>2</sup> was even less calculated to propagate exempla original to themselves. Such rivals of the national Examples as arose from time to time henceforth — one thinks of Socrates<sup>3</sup> — were introduced through the medium of history and of philosophy.

The number of the national Exempla, and the frequency of their mention, will compel me in the space of the present article to proceed by a combination of conspectus with illustration, such as can do little more than give an intimation of the further details of the subject, on which much more work needs to be done. The nature of these I shall endeavor to suggest by some comments on a list of national exempla, and by discussing with some fulness several typical instances. A memorandum of the cases in which men of the Imperial period, both private citizens and emperors — notably Augustus, are named as belonging to the Exempla, will then give evidence that even the less commonly cited instances are almost exclusively ante-imperial; some of the influences which led to the closing of what is, therefore, virtually an exemplary canon, I shall seek to discover. Among these, books of exempla and representative writers will claim most of our attention.

In attempting to make plain the significance of a given *exemplum*, a mere lump estimate of his importance, without indication of the creed and moral bias of the authors who mention him, is at best but

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the comparative status of the Roman Republic and Empire, below, pp. 53 ff.

<sup>2</sup> And was there a tendency rather to Romanize these? Cf. the identification of Greek and Persian with like Italian divinities. So, I am told, the Mithraists of Rome substituted for the Persian originals of their cult their own national heroes.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the sneer of Florus, above, p. 15, n. 3, *ad fin.*

an unsatisfactory method; its most adequate apology is suggested by a consideration of the preponderance in Roman morals of the Stoic attitude.<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of a general catalogue of exempla I have found it obligatory in some instances to distinguish the Christian from the pagan standard; for the rest, I must ask the reader to take my judgment on faith. It is based on careful examination of the literature through Claudian, with some reference to Greek and to the later Latin literature. Some significant passages may well have escaped my notice. But I believe that as a whole the results summarized may be accepted as reasonably complete.

In estimating the relative weight of the various kinds of passages in which persons are mentioned as notable for virtue or vice, I have borne in mind certain general principles. I have not reckoned as genuine cases of exemplary citation either narrative mention by historians in the chronological sequence of their account, or a laudatory epigram which has for its subject a single individual, or contemporary references; but have employed these three classes for purposes of illustration and comparison only. Nearly contemporary references — references, that is, to a given *exemplum* in the works of an author born in his lifetime — I have regarded as of inferior importance, and so also mention for irrelevant causes: when, for example, the motive which prompts allusion to the virtue is an impressive change of fortune, an unworthy son, or the writer's desire to set before an emperor an example drawn from the case of another emperor.

I have throughout had less regard to the references — often perfunctory merely — in books of exempla, than to the great body of Latin literature. Accordingly, the list of exempla below takes no account whatever of references in such books to persons mentioned there only as instances.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, the great "enemies" — Pyrrhus, Hannibal, Spartacus, and the like — are included as virtu-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lecky, *op. cit.*, above, p. 4, n. 4, and *passim*; Warde Fowler, *Religious Experience*, pp. 362 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Hence the omission, e.g., of Sex. Tempanius, one of Livy's favorite heroes (cf. Teuffel-Schwabe, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, 1910<sup>6</sup>, § 257, 4). The reader who desires a complete list of the exempla placed by the handbooks at a declaimer's disposal, may easily glean such supplementary matter from the historians and from the books of exempla, — most conveniently from the classified lists of Valerius Maximus.

ally national, having derived their chief significance from a relation to the Roman state.<sup>1</sup>

For a list of national *exempla virtutis*<sup>2</sup> cited by Roman writers through Claudian, see pages 28-35.

The application of all this will be made clearer by illustration.<sup>3</sup> Let us trace in some detail the legend of a typical *exemplum maius*,

<sup>1</sup> Leaving out of account the "expatriates" — notably Sp. Cassius, Maelius, Catiline, Sertorius — I find most frequently mentioned Antiochus, Brennus, Mettus Fufetius, Hannibal, Hasdrubal, Jugurtha, Mithridates, Perses, Porsenna, Spartacus, Syphax, Tigranes. Cf. e.g. Prudentius, cited above, p. 22, n. 1, and Sall. *Hist.* 1, 55, 3 f. (Maurenbrecher): "... Praeclara Brutorum atque Aemiliorum et Lutatorum proles, geniti ad ea quae maiores virtute peperere subvertenda! Nam quid a Pyrrho Hannibale Philipppoque et Antiocho defensum est aliud quam libertas et suae cuique sedes, neu cui nisi legibus pareremus? . . ." The availability of these as *exempla viti* naturally decreases in direct proportion to the growth of cosmopolitanism; cf. Lecky, *op. cit.*, pp. 239 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The *exempla* are arranged alphabetically, with reference first to *nomina*, next to *cognomina*, next to *praenomina*, and thereafter chronologically. Emperors are placed with reference to the name by which they are commonly known.

Four grades of prominence are distinguished, indicated respectively by capitals, full face Roman, italics, and ordinary Roman type. The determination of these must, of course, be largely subjective. I have borne in mind that an *exemplum paupertatis* or *castitatis* will naturally be represented by fewer citations than an *exemplum fortitudinis*, and so forth; hence Claudia, Cincinnatus, and Serranus are rated above Marcellus. Furthermore, I have had regard to permanence of fame; hence the low rating of Coruncanius (cf. below, p. 50). Omissions (cf. above, p. 25) will naturally be most likely to occur in the lowest grade.

Names of *exempla* who lived under the Empire are preceded by an obelisk †. Those marked (†) lived also under the Republic.

A sign \* indicates citation as an example of the given virtue directly beneath which the sign stands; a sign —, of the corresponding vice; a sign *i*, of the given virtue exhibited especially in a military connection; a sign *m*, *constantia in morte propinquorum*. Citations of comparatively slight importance are enclosed in parentheses. The addition of a sign *c* denotes that the citations in question are by Christian writers only; of the same sign in parentheses (*c*), that the citations are in part by Christians. The *virtutes* — which, once more, no conspectus can present with more than approximate accuracy — are of course not meant to be taken as mutually exclusive; the principle is simply that an *exemplum* which cannot be readily identified with the more particular shall be entered under the more general head. A conflict of duties is noted X.

Citations of an emperor as an example for another emperor are not included; for these, see below, p. 55, n. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Throughout the following pages, in references to patristic writers, figures en-

the facts of whose life are familiar — Lucius Junius Brutus. The moralists found their material in his interpretation of the Delphic oracle; the part which he took in avenging Lucretia, in expelling Superbus and his sons, and establishing the Commonwealth; lastly the acts of his consulship — the banishment *favente populo* of his colleague, his order for the execution of his sons, his heroic death in combat with Arruns.<sup>1</sup> The typical patriot, the *vir iustus et fortis*, his memory was invoked more rarely as an example of *prudentia* and a defender of woman's honour.

His authority is appealed to first and most comprehensively by Cicero, who is never weary of sounding his praise: “. . . Homines Graeci, quos antea nominavi, inique a suis civibus damnati atque expulsi tamen, quia bene sunt de suis civitatibus meriti, tanta hodie gloria sunt non in Graecia solum, sed etiam apud nos atque in ceteris terris, ut eos a quibus illi oppressi sint, nemo nominet, horum calamitatem dominationi illorum omnes anteponant. Quis Carthaginensium pluris fuit Hannibale consilio, virtute, rebus gestis, qui unus cum tot imperatoribus nostris per tot annos de imperio et de gloria decertavit? hunc sui cives e civitate elecerunt; nos etiam hostem litteris nostris et memoria videmus esse celebratum. Quare imitemur nostros Brutos, Camillos, Ahalas, Decios, Curios, Fabricios, Maximos, Scipiones, Lentulos, Aemilios, innumerabiles alios, qui hanc rem publicam stabiliverunt; quos equidem in deorum immortalium coetu ac numero repono. Amemus patriam, pareamus senatui, consulamus bonis; praesentis fructus neglegamus, posteritatis gloriae serviamus, id esse optimum putemus quod erit rectissimum, speremus quae volumus sed quod acciderit feramus, cogitemus denique corpus viro-  
rum fortium magnorumque hominum esse mortale, animi vero motus et virtutis gloriam sempiternam, neque, hanc opinionem si in illo sanctissimo Hercule consecratam videmus, cuius corpore ambusto vitam eius et virtutem immortalitas excepisse dicatur, minus existimemus eos qui hanc tantam rem publicam suis consiliis aut laboribus aut auxerint aut defenderint aut servarint, esse immortalem gloriam consecutos.”<sup>2</sup> He is *par excellence* the Liberator: “An me censetis,

closed by parentheses indicate volume and column of Migne. References to the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* are to the edition of Peter, 1884.

<sup>1</sup> Pauly, *Real-Encyclopädie*, s. v. *Iunii*, I, 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Sest.* 142 f.

## NATIONAL EXEMPLA VIRTUTIS CITED BY ROMAN WRITERS THROUGH CLAUDIAN

|                                          | <i>virtus</i>     | <i>aequitas</i> | <i>fides</i> | <i>pietas erga</i> |     |    |    | <i>constantia</i> | <i>continentia</i> | <i>pauertas</i> | <i>pruditia</i> | <i>clementia</i> | <i>moderatio</i> |
|------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|-----|----|----|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Q. Aelius Paetus cos. 167.....           | ..                | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | * *             | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| Q. Aelius Tubero Pauli gener.....        | ..                | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| M. Aemilius Lepidus cos. I 187.....      | * ..              | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| Q. Aemilius Papus cos. I 282.....        | * ..              | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| L. Aemilius Paulus cos. I 219.....       | * ..              | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | m                 | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| L. Aemilius Paulus cos. I 182.....       | * <sup>i</sup> .. | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | *m                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| M. Aemilius Scaurus cos. I 115.....      | * ..              | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| Aeneas.....                              | X                 | ..              | ..           | ..                 | *-c | .. | .. | ..                | -c                 | ..              | ..              | -c               | ..               |
| Aeserninus.....                          | -                 | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| Ancus Marcius.....                       | * ..              | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | *                 | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| †L. Annaeus Seneca.....                  | ..                | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| T. Annius Milo.....                      | -                 | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| †Antoninus Pius.....                     | (*)               | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| M. Antonius cos. 99.....                 | ..                | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | *                | ..               |
| M. Antonius triumvir.....                | (i)-              | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | m                 | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| L. Appuleius Saturninus tr. pl. 100..... | -                 | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| M'. Aquilius cos. 101.....               | ..                | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | * *                | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| †Arria maior.....                        | ..                | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| Atia Octavi.....                         | *                 | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| A. Atilius Calatinus cos. I 258.....     | *                 | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| M. Atilius Regulus.....                  | ..                | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| C (?). Atilius Serranus.....             | *                 | ..              | ..           | ..                 | *   | .. | .. | ..                | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| Cn. Aufidius praet. 108.....             | ..                | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | m                 | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | ..               |
| (†)Augustus.....                         | *X                | ..              | ..           | ..                 | ..  | .. | .. | m                 | ..                 | ..              | ..              | ..               | (*)              |



## NATIONAL EXEMPLA VIRTUTIS CITED BY ROMAN WRITERS THROUGH CLAUDIAN (continued)

|                                                    | tirius | aquilas | fides | deos | patriam | parentes | celeris | severitas | fortitudo | constantia | continentia | paupertas | prudencia | clementia | moderatio |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|-------|------|---------|----------|---------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| C. Cornelius Cethegus Catilinae socius. ....       | —      | ..      | ..    | ..   | — (*)   | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| L. Cornelius Cinna cos. I 87. ....                 | —      | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| A. Cornelius Cossus tr. mil. 426. ....             | ..     | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| Cornelius Gallus. ....                             | *      | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | m          | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| Lentuli. ....                                      | ..     | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| L. Cornelius Lentulus Lupus cos. 156. ....         | —      | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| Cn. Cornelius Scipio Calvus cos. 222. ....         | *i     | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| L. Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus cos. 190. ....       | i      | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| P. Cornelius Scipio cos. 218. ....                 | *i     | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| P. CORNELIUS SCIPIO AFRICANUS MAIOR. ....          | *i     | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Corculum cos. 162. .... | *      | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| P. CORNELIUS SCIPIO AFRICANUS MINOR. ....          | *i     | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | i         | ..        | *m         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio cos. 138. ....  | *      | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| P. CORNELIUS SULLA FELIX. ....                     | — (*)  | —       | —     | ..   | .. (*)  | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| Ti. Cornucanius cos. 280. ....                     | *      | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| M'. CURIUS DENTATUS. ....                          | *i     | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| Q. CURTIUS. ....                                   | ..     | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| M. CURTIUS. ....                                   | —      | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| DECI. ....                                         | ..     | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| T. Didius T. F. cos. 98. ....                      | *i     | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| C. Duilius cos. 260. ....                          | *i     | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |
| Fabii CCC. ....                                    | ..     | ..      | ..    | ..   | ..      | ..       | ..      | ..        | ..        | ..         | ..          | ..        | ..        | ..        | ..        |

gravitas  
concordia  
comitas  
gravitas  
avaritia  
aleator

[illegible]







## NATIONAL EXEMPLA VIRTUTIS CITED BY ROMAN WRITERS THROUGH CLAUDIAN (continued)

|                                                    | <i>virtus</i> | <i>aequitas</i> | <i>fides</i> | <i>pietas erga</i> | <i>severitas</i> | <i>fortitudo</i> | <i>constantia</i> | <i>continentia</i> | <i>pauertas</i> | <i>prudencia</i> | <i>clementia</i> | <i>moderatio</i> |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Kaeso Quinctius . . . . .                          | *             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| L. QUINCTUS CININNATUS . . . . .                   |               |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| L. Quinctius Flaminius cos. 192 . . . . .          | 1             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| T. Quinctius Flaminius cos. 198 . . . . .          | 2             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| †Quintilii fratres . . . . .                       |               |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| Remus . . . . .                                    |               |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    | *               |                  |                  |                  |
| ROMULUS . . . . .                                  | 2             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    | *               |                  |                  |                  |
| Rutlia Cottae . . . . .                            |               |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| P. Rutilius Lupus cos. 90 . . . . .                |               |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| P. Rutilius Rufus cos. 105 . . . . .               | *             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| C. Sempronius Gracchus tr. pl. 122 . . . . .       | *             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| T. Sempronius Gracchus cos. 177 . . . . .          | *             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| Ti. Sempronius Gracchus tr. pl. 133 . . . . .      | *             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| L. SERGIUS CATILINA . . . . .                      | 1             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| M. Sergius Silus Catilinae proavus . . . . .       |               |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| Q. Sertorius praet. 83 . . . . .                   | 2             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| C. Servilius Structus Ahala mag. eq. 439 . . . . . |               |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| †Servilius Barea Soranus . . . . .                 | *             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| C. Servilius Glaucia praet. 100 . . . . .          | 1             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus cos. 79 . . . . .     | 2             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| Servius Tullius . . . . .                          | *             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    | (*)             |                  |                  |                  |
| (†) Q. Sextius . . . . .                           |               |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| L. Sicinius Dentatus tr. pl. 454 . . . . .         |               |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| Spartacus hostis . . . . .                         | 1             |                 |              |                    |                  |                  |                   |                    | *               |                  |                  |                  |

concordia

magnanimus

duritia



patres conscripti, quod vos inviti secuti estis, decreturum fuisse . . . ut decernerentur supplicationes mortuo ? nihil dico cui. Fuerit ille Brutus, qui et ipse dominatu regio rem publicam liberavit et ad similem virtutem et simile factum stirpem iam prope in quingentesimum annum propagavit; adduci tamen non possem ut quemquam mortuum coniungerem cum deorum immortalium religione.”<sup>1</sup> And again:<sup>2</sup> “. . . Vita atque factis inlustrata sunt summorum virorum haec quae verbis subtilius quam satis est, disputari videntur. Quaero enim a vobis num ullam cogitationem habuisse videantur ii qui hanc rem publicam tam praeclare fundatam nobis reliquerunt, aut argenti ad avaritiam aut amoenitatum ad delectationem aut suppellectilis ad delicias aut epularum ad voluptates. Ponite ante oculos unum quemque veterum. Voltis a Romulo ? Voltis post liberam civitatem ab iis ipsis qui liberaverunt ? Quibus tandem gradibus Romulus escendit in caelum ? iisne quae isti bona appellant, an rebus gestis atque virtutibus ? Quid ? a Numa Pompilio minusne gratas dis immortalibus capudines ac fictiles urnulas fuisse quam felicitas Saliorum pateras arbitramur ? Omitto reliquos; sunt enim omnes pares inter se praeter Superbum. Brutum si qui roget quid egerit in patria liberanda, si quis item reliquos eiusdem consili socios quid spectaverint, quid secuti sint, num quis exsistat cui voluptas, cui divitiae, cui denique praeter officium fortis et magni viri quicquam aliud propositum fuisse videatur ? Quae res ad necem Porsennae C. Mucium inpulit sine ulla spe salutis suae ? Quae vis Coclitum contra omnes hostium copias tenuit in ponte solum ? Quae patrem Decium, quae filium devota vita inmisit in armatas hostium copias ? Quid continentia C. Fabrici, quid tenuitas victus M’. Curi sequebatur ? Quid duo propugnacula belli Punici, Cn. et P. Scipiones, qui Carthaginensium adventum corporibus suis intercludendum putaverunt ? quid Africanus maior, <quid minor> ? quid inter horum aetates interiectus Cato ? quid innumerabiles alii — nam domesticis exemplis abundamus — cogitassene quicquam in vita sibi esse expetendum nisi quod laudabile esset et praeclarum, videntur ? Veniant igitur isti inrisores huius orationis ac sententiae et iam vel ipsi iudicent utrum se horum aliquis qui marmoreis tectis ebore et auro fulgentibus, qui signis, qui tabulis, qui caelato auro et argento, qui Corinthiis operibus abundant,

<sup>1</sup> *Phil.* i, 13.<sup>2</sup> *Parad.* 10 ff.

an C. Fabrici, qui nihil habuit eorum, nihil habere voluit, similes malint." He is the type of *fortitudo*: ". . . Ego ne Torquatum quidem illum qui hoc cognomen invenit, iratum existimo Gallo torquem detraxisse, nec Marcellum apud Clastidium ideo fortem fuisse quia fuerit iratus. De Africano quidem, quia notior est nobis propter recentem memoriam, vel iurare possum non illum iracundia tum inflammatum fuisse cum in acie M. Allienium Paelignum scuto protexerit gladiumque hosti in pectus infixerit. De L. Bruto fortasse dubitarim, an propter infinitum odium tyranni ecfrenatius in Arruntem invaserit; video enim utrumque *comminus ictu cecidissee contrario*. Quid igitur huc adhibetis iram? an fortitudo, nisi insanire coepit, impetus suos non habet?"<sup>1</sup>

In the case of no other *exemplum* is the "conflict of duties" more clearly and interestingly illustrated, and the shift of emphasis from one to another virtue shown.<sup>2</sup> In Brutus' punishment of his sons, were the claims of fatherhood and of mercy rightly outweighed by those of strict justice (*severitas*) and the interest of the State? In the affair of Collatinus, should duty to the State or to his colleague have prevailed?

On the first question Cicero has nothing to say; most instructive is his ruling on the latter: "Incidunt multae saepe causae quae conturbent animos utilitatis specie, non cum hoc deliberetur, relinquendane sit honestas propter utilitatis magnitudinem — nam id quidem improbum est — sed illud, possitne id quod utile videatur, fieri non turpiter. Cum Collatino collegae Brutus imperium abrogabat, poterat videri facere id iniuste; fuerat enim in regibus expellendis socius Bruti consiliorum et adiutor. Cum autem consilium hoc principes cepissent, cognationem Superbi nomenque Tarquiniorum et memoriam regni esse tollendam, quod erat utile, patriae consulere, id erat ita honestum ut etiam ipsi Collatino placere deberet. Itaque utilitas valuit propter honestatem, sine qua ne utilitas quidem esse potuisset. At in eo rege qui urbem condidit non item; species enim utilitatis animum pepulit eius; cui cum visum esset utilius solum quam cum altero regnare, fratrem interemit. Omisit hic et pietatem et humanitatem, ut id quod utile videbatur neque erat, assequi posset, et tamen

<sup>1</sup> *Tusc.* 4, 49 f.

<sup>2</sup> On the conflict of duties, see also below, p. 55, with n. 1.

muri causam opposuit, speciem honestatis nec probabilem nec sane idoneam. Peccavit igitur, pace vel Quirini vel Romuli dixerim.”<sup>1</sup> With Cicero discussion of this conflict practically disappears from Roman literature. Augustine’s treatment destroys the conflict by denying the *utilitas*.<sup>2</sup>

Virgil, unlike Cicero, has no express allusion to Collatinus; Anchises tells Aeneas only of the execution of the sons:

“Vis et Tarquinius reges animamque superbam  
ultoris Bruti fascesque videre receptos ?  
Consulis imperium hic primus saevasque secures  
accipiet, natosque pater nova bella moventes  
ad poenam pulchra pro libertate vocabit,  
infelix. Utcumque ferent ea facta minores,  
vincet amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido.  
Quin Decios Drusosque procul saevumque securi  
aspice Torquatam et referentem signa Camillum.”<sup>3</sup>

Virgil’s silence is perhaps responsible for the almost complete disregard by later writers of Collatinus’ exile and of the circumstances of Brutus’ death. The punishment of the sons remained a *locus classicus* with declaimers in the schools; it afforded a ready defence for severity on the part of a father: “Animadvertit Manlius in filium et victorem, animadvertit Brutus in liberos non factos hostes sed futuros; vide an sub his exemplis patri fortius tantum loqui liceat.”<sup>4</sup> Quintilian finds material for an illustration of the *dissimile*: “Brutus occidit liberos proditorem molientis, Manlius virtutem filii morte multavit.”<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Off.* 3, 40 f. Of this work the entire third book is devoted to a discussion of conflicts between the *honestum* and the *utile*.

<sup>2</sup> *Civ. Dei*, 3, 16: “Etiamne ista est gloria, Iunii Bruti detestanda iniquitas et nihilo utilis rei publicae ? Etiamne ad hanc perpetranda

*vici amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido ?*

Iam expulso utique Tarquinio tyranno consul cum Bruto creatus est maritus Lucretiae L. Tarquinius Collatinus. Quam iuste populus mores in cive, non nomen atendit! Quam impie Brutus collegam primae ac novae illius potestatis, quem posset, si hoc offerebatur, nomine tantum privare, et patria privavit et honore! ” The violence of this mention is rather surprising in an author who has withal something of a weakness for the pagan exempla.

<sup>3</sup> *Aen.* 6, 817 ff. The whole passage, from 752 on, should be read in this connection.

<sup>4</sup> *Sen. Contr.* 10, 3, 8.

<sup>5</sup> *Inst.* 5, 11, 7.

A similar conflict is instanced, as these passages suggest, by Manlius Torquatus' command for the execution of a son just before the battle of the Veseris.<sup>1</sup> The consuls' order against skirmishing was strict; the son accepted the challenge of a knight of Tusculum and slew him in single combat. So extreme a case wins nevertheless universal commendation<sup>2</sup> from pre-Christian casuists, saving only a declaimer's charge of *impotentia* against the commander "cui non nocuit et filium et victorem occidere."<sup>3</sup>

Christian writers, on the other hand, are quite as unanimous in silence or censure. Their horror of Torquatus' inhumanity, joined with the customary animus against pagan heroes, effectually prevents them from according recognition to any of his achievements. To the stock reproaches of worldliness and vainglory already brought by Augustine<sup>4</sup> without reference to the conflict, Dracontius<sup>5</sup> adds a repetition of the declaimer's specious plea:<sup>6</sup>

. . . Nato pro laude periculum  
intulit, ostendens quae sit censura parentis.  
Nam neque culpa fuit. Patriae pugnando triumphum  
vulneribus dedit ille suis. . . .  
Quis, rogo, dux poenas unquam est victoribus ausus? . . .

and so on, through thirty-four hexameter lines of — I venture to hope — the worst fustian in Latin literature. The change in the Roman ethical standard wrought by Christianity could not be more strikingly shown, however, than by the attitude of Augustine's *a Christi nomine*

<sup>1</sup> B. C. 340; cf. below, p. 46.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Val. Max. 2, 7, 6: "Nostra urbs, quae omni genere mirificorum exemplorum totum terrarum orbem replevit, imperatorum proprio sanguine manantes secures [habet], ne turbato militiae ordine vindicta deesset, ex castris publice speciosas, privatim lugubres duplici vultu recepit, incerta gratulandi prius an adloquendi officio fungeretur. Igitur ego quoque haesitante animo vos, bellicarum rerum severissimi custodes, Postumi Tuberte et Manli Torquate, memoria ac relatione conplector, qui <a> animadverto fore ut pondere laudis quam meruistis, obrutus magis inbecillitatem ingenii mei detegam quam vestram virtutem, sicut par est, repraesentem. . . ." Cf. *ibid.* 5, 8, 3.

<sup>3</sup> Sen. *Contr.* 9, 2, 19.

<sup>4</sup> *Civ. Dei*, 5, 18; cf. below, pp. 41 f.

<sup>5</sup> *De Deo*, 3, 352 ff.; cf. below, p. 41.

<sup>6</sup> Sen., *l. c.*



*alienus*, who thus recounts the advice given to the future Emperor Honorius by his father:

“Interea Musis animus, dum mollior, instet  
et quae mox imitere legat; nec desinat umquam  
tecum Graia loqui, tecum Romana vetustas.  
Antiquos evolve duces, adsuesce futurae  
militiae, Latium retro te confer in aevum.  
Libertas quaesita placet? mirabere Brutum.  
Perfidiam damnas? Metti satiabere poenis.  
*Triste rigor nimius? Torquati despice mores.*  
Mors impensa bonum? Decios venerare ruentes.  
Vel solus quid fortis agat, te ponte soluto  
oppositus Cocles, Muci te flamma docebit;  
quid mora perfringat, Fabius; quid rebus in artis  
dux gerat, ostendet Gallorum strage Camillus.  
Discitur hinc nullos meritis obsistere casus:  
prorogat aeternam feritas tibi Punica famam,  
Regule; successus superant adversa Catonis.  
Discitur hinc quantum paupertas sobria possit:  
pauper erat Curius, reges cum vinceret armis,  
pauper Fabricius, Pyrrhi cum sperneret aurum;  
sordida dictator flexit Serranus aratra,  
lustratae lictore casae fascesque salignis  
postibus adfixi, collectae consule messes  
et sulcata diu trabeato rura colono.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Claud. 8, 401 ff.; cf. the same writer's indignant protest against the elevation of Eutropius, 18, 452:

Per te perque tuos obtestor Roma triumphos,  
nesciat hoc Thybris, numquam poscentibus olim  
qui dare Dentatis annos Fabiisque solebat.  
Martius eunuchi repetet suffragia campus?  
Aemilios inter servatoresque Camillos  
Eutropius? Iam Chrysogonis tua, Brute, potestas  
Narcissisque datur? Natos hoc dedere poenae  
profruit et misero civem praeponere patri?  
Hoc mihi Ianiculo positis Etruria castris  
quaesiit et tantum fluvio Porsenna remotus?  
Hoc meruit vel ponte Cocles vel Mucius igne?  
Visceribus frustra castum Lucretia ferrum  
mersit et attonitum tranavit Cloelia Thybrim?  
Eutropio fasces adservabantur adempti  
Tarquiniis? Quemcumque meae vexere curules,  
laxato veniat socium aversatus Averno.  
Impensi sacris Decii prorumpite bustis  
Torquatique truces animosaeque pauperis umbra  
Fabricii tuque o, si forte inferna piorum

With Brutus, the conflict of duties naturally gives rise to somewhat less severe comment on the part of the Fathers, if we except the virulence of Cyprian's great attack on the Heroes: ". . . Est et gradus summus in Romanis honoribus consulatus. Sic consulatum coepisse videmus ut regnum; filios interficit Brutus ut crescat de suffragio sceleris commendatio dignitatis. . . ." <sup>1</sup> The unreasoning petulance of this onslaught, like that of Dracontius' invective against Torquatus, <sup>2</sup> hardly deserves mention, perhaps, as a serious contribution to the adjustment of a conflict of duties. The same is true of what Dracontius has to say of Brutus; though here the criticism — still centring on the punishment of the sons — is milder, and a better type of the usual Christian attitude:

Historias currant Danaum gentisque Quirinae.  
Qua pro laude sua, vel qua pro regno alieno,  
mentibus infectis animosae cladis amore,  
ausi omnes scelerare manus de morte suorum,  
aut certe de strage sua. . . .  
Quae Romanus amor patres implere coegit,  
dicere si valeam, vero sermone probabo.  
Optima nam vindex exempla ac pessima Brutus,  
horror amorque novus, civis pius, impius auctor,  
iure pater patriae, natis et regibus hostis,  
atque pudicitiae laesae castissimus ultor  
post regale nefas, quod castae gessit adulter. . . .  
Dulcis amor patriae, qui patrem fecit amarum,  
aut fecit non esse patrem iam prole perempta;  
pro quibus arma tulit, hoc se qui pignore privat! <sup>3</sup>

Augustine's chief purpose in his most extended mention of Brutus is an exaltation of a better than the earthly fatherland: ". . . Quid

iugera et Elysias scindis, Serrane, novales.  
Poeni Scipiadae, Poeno praeclare Lutati,  
Sicania Marcelle ferox, gens Claudia surgas  
et Curii veteres; et, qui sub iure negasti  
vivere Caesareo, parvo procede sepulcro  
Eutropium passure Cato; remeate tenebris,  
agmina Brutorum Corvinorumque catervae.  
Eunuchi vestros habitus, insignia sumunt  
ambigui Romana mares; rapuere tremendas  
Hannibali Pyrrhoque togas; flabella perosi  
adspirant trabeis; iam non umbracula gestant  
virginibus, Latias ausi vibrare secures!

<sup>1</sup> *Idol. Van.* 5 (4, 572 A).

<sup>2</sup> Above, p. 39.

<sup>3</sup> *De Deo* 3, 314 ff.

ergo magnum est pro illa aeterna caelestique patria cuncta saeculi huius quamlibet iucunda blandimenta contemnere, si pro hac temporali atque terrena filios Brutus potuit et occidere, quod illa facere neminem cogit? . . . Haec sunt duo illa, libertas et cupiditas laudis humanae, quae ad facta compulit miranda Romanos. Si ergo pro libertate moriturorum et cupiditate laudum quae a mortalibus expectuntur, occidi filii a patre potuerunt, quid magnum est si pro vera libertate, quae nos ab iniquitatis et mortis et diaboli dominatu liberos facit, nec cupiditate humanarum laudum, sed caritate liberandorum hominum, non a Tarquinio rege, sed a daemonibus et daemonum principe, non filii occiduntur, sed Christi pauperes inter filios computantur? ”<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that the Christian casuists, in adjusting this conflict, adhere closely to well-known principles of their faith. With single devotion to the heavenly country, they depreciate correspondingly the earthly fatherland. Hence duty to that fatherland, they hold, cannot maintain itself for a moment against the claims of parenthood. The more violent partisans press the charge of vainglory.

Similar reproaches are brought by Christian writers against the wider fame of Brutus, independent of any conflict: we shall later have occasion to consider more fully such attacks, as best instanced in the case of Scaevola.<sup>2</sup> Equally pronounced in Brutus' praise are the champions of the old order.<sup>3</sup> In the last age of the Empire, the splendid tributes of Claudian<sup>4</sup> reflect undiminished the glory which had survived nine centuries.

In sharp contrast with the fame of the elder Brutus is that of Marcus, the tyrannicide, as regards both its distinction and its character. Here, too, the conflict is of *pietas*, — of the duty to country, once more, against that to a benefactor and friend. The case is complicated, furthermore, by the close connection of that benefactor with the reigning house, and by a genuine doubt concerning the utility of the tyrannicide.<sup>5</sup> I have been interested in comparing the few

<sup>1</sup> *Civ. Dei* 5, 18.

<sup>2</sup> Below, pp. 67 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 44, n. 8.

<sup>4</sup> 8, 401; 17, 163; 18, 440 (and 460?); 22, 322 and 383; 24, 192. Cf. 20, 141 and 28, 642. See below, p. 44, n. 8.

<sup>5</sup> That is, there is here a conflict of *utilitas* as well as of *honestum*. Cf. Cic. *Off.* 2, *passim*.

brief mentions upon which rests Brutus' claim to a place among the Exempla.

References in authors before the age of Augustus are, naturally, too much colored by partisanship to authorize us in giving them any weight;<sup>1</sup> the Augustan age itself yields us no passage in which Brutus is cited as an example. The first valid citation, it appears,<sup>2</sup> is by Seneca,<sup>3</sup> in an encomium on *virtus*: ". . . Haec Lucretiam Bruto aequavit, nescias an praetulerit . . . haec aequavit Corneliam Graccho, haec Porciam alteri Bruto; notior est marito suo Tanaquil. . . ." We come to the time of the Flavians. In the *Octavia*<sup>4</sup> Nero is made to denounce as an act of folly

servare cives principi et patriae graves,  
claro tumentes genere. . . .  
. . . Brutus in caedem ducis  
a quo salutem tulerat armavit manus. . . .

Familiar is Martial's gibe at the *littérateur*:

. . . epistulisque commodat gravem vultum  
similis Catoni Tullioque Brutoque.<sup>5</sup>

Juvenal's appeal is of all most unequivocal:

. . . Dociles imitandis  
turpibus ac pravis omnes sumus, et Catilinam  
quocumque in populo videas quocumque sub axe,  
sed nec Brutus erit Bruti nec avunculus umquam.<sup>6</sup>

Equally decided is the tone of the courtier Valerius Maximus: "M. Brutus suarum prius virtutum quam patriae parentis parricida — uno enim facto et illas in profundum praecipitavit et omnem nominis sui memoriam inexpressibili detestatione perfudit — ultimum proelium initurus, negantibus quibusdam id committi oportere, 'Fidenter,' inquit, 'in aciem descendo; hodie enim aut recte erit aut nihil curabo.' Praesumerat videlicet neque vivere se sine victoria neque mori sine securitate posse."<sup>7</sup> This is the only place accorded Brutus in the

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4, 34 f.; below, p. 45.

<sup>3</sup> Fr. 79 Haase.

<sup>4</sup> 498.

<sup>7</sup> 6, 4, 5, under the caption *Graviter Dicta*.

<sup>5</sup> 5, 51, 5.

<sup>6</sup> 14, 43.

Book of *Exempla par excellence*: Ampelius, however, reckons him <sup>1</sup> among the *viri in toga illustres*, and so the author *De Viris Illustribus*.<sup>2</sup> Marcus Aurelius <sup>3</sup> ranks him with Thræsea, Helvidius, Cato, and Dio as a Stoic sage whose memory he holds precious. St. Jerome harks back, as often, to Seneca: “. . . Quid referam Catonis filiam, Bruti coniugem, cuius virtus facit ne patris maritique constantiam tantopere miremur?”<sup>4</sup> These are all the literature of the Empire has to offer.<sup>5</sup>

Yet the character of the younger Brutus had been conspicuous in a corrupt age <sup>6</sup> for probity no less genuine, if less ostentatiously displayed, than that of either Cato. His virtues, as well as those of Cato of Utica, were rendered the more illustrious by the precedent of a famous ancestor. He sought death, if from less high motives than Cato, yet with equal resolve. His only notable failing was one at all times leniently regarded by the Roman, inhumanity in the form of avarice; of this both Catos were guilty, though in a less marked degree.<sup>7</sup> Yet appeals to the authority of both these as exempla are innumerable; in the case of Brutus, barely a dozen, and those for the most part questionable, can be found — a singular chance indeed, and one hardly to be accounted for except as a cumulative effect: Brutus' virtue was less ostentatious than Cato's, his chief faults more striking; his offence against the founder of the imperial line more direct, and aggravated by ingratitude; he met death only after having survived liberty.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 19, 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Add.* 82.

<sup>3</sup> 1, 14.

<sup>4</sup> *Comm. Sophon., ap.* Migne 25 (6), 673.

<sup>5</sup> See also below, n. 8 *fin.*, with p. 45.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Lecky, *op. cit.*, 1, 238 f.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, 1, 203 f.

<sup>8</sup> L. Brutus is cited as an *exemplum virtutis* in the following passages only: Cic. *Brut.* 53; *Sest.* 143; *Planc.* 60; *Phil.* 1, 13; 2, 26 and 114; 3, 9 and 11; *Octav.* 10; *Tusc.* 1, 89; 4, 50; *Off.* 3, 40; *Sen.* 74; *Parad.* 12; Auct. Her. 4, 66; Verg. *Aen.* 6, 818; Liv. 8, 34, 3; Sen. *Contr.* 9, 2, 9; 10, 3, 8; Prop. 4, 1, 45; Manil. 1, 785; Val. Max. 5, 6, 1 and 8, 1; 7, 3, 2; Sen. *Dial.* 6, 16, 2; fr. 79 Haase; *Oct.* 294; Sil. 8, 361; 11, 95; 13, 721; Pers. 5, 85; Quint. *Inst.* 5, 11, 7; *Decl.* 268, p. 93, 24; Luc. 5, 207; 6, 792; 7, 440; Mart. 11, 16, 10; Stat. *Silv.* 1, 4, 41; Juv. 4, 103; Plin. *Pan.* 55, 6; Ampel. 18, 1; Cypr. *Idol. Van.* 5 (4, 572 A); *de Vir. Ill.* 10; Hier. *Iovin.* 1, 49 (23 = 2, 320); Aug. *Civ. Dei* 2, 17; 5, 18; *Ep.* 138, 2, 10 (33,

It is however not Brutus the tyrannicide, but Cassius, whom absence makes truly conspicuous among the Instances. I need not do more than quote the only passages in which even an approach to exemplary citation is found:—

Tacitus, *Annals*, 4, 34 f.: “Cremutius Cordus postulatur . . . quod editis annalibus laudatoque M. Bruto C. Cassium Romanorum ultimum dixisset. . . .”

Juvenal, 5, 33 ff.:

. . . Cras bibet . . .  
quale coronati Thræsea Helvidiusque bibebant  
Brutorum et Cassi natalibus. . . .

Pliny, *Epist.* 1, 17, 3: “Est omnino Capitoni in usu claros viros colere; mirum est qua religione, quo studio imagines Brutorum, Cassiorum, Catonum domi ubi potest habeat.”

Apparently the admonition given authors by the punishment of Cremutius, was pretty effectual, so far as literary mention goes. Certainly this fails signally to reflect the cult attested by Juvenal and Pliny.<sup>1</sup>

Enough of the conflicts of *pietas*. Let us now, for a concluding illustration, pass to unvexed instances of some cardinal virtue. Perhaps the characteristically Roman *fortitudo* will best meet our purpose.

529); Claud. 8, 401; 17, 163; 18, 440; 22, 322 and 383; 24, 192; Oros. 2, 5, 1; Dracont. *de Deo* 3, 314; Boëth. *Cons.* 2, m. 7; Panegy. Bähr. 12, 20, p. 289, 9.

Either Brutus may be the subject of the citation in Mart. 11, 5, 9; either or both, of those in Plin. *Ep.* 1, 17, 3; Hier. *Ep.* 60, 5 (22, 335); Claud. 18, 460. Apparently Pliny has reference to Marcus (see below, p. 37), Martial and Claudian to Lucius. Claudian has mentioned Lucius already, 440; a similar negligence (?) may be observed in his double mention of Dentatus, 437 and 457. Marcus and either Lucius or Decimus are intended by Juv. 5, 37 (see below, p. 45).

In addition to the genuine citations, reference should be had to the notices of L. Brutus in Cic. *de Or.* 1, 37 and 225; *Brut.* 130; *Phil.* 5, 17; *Fin.* 2, 66; *Tusc.* 4, 2; *Rep.* 2, 46; Sall. *Hist.* 1, 55, 3 (Maurenbrecher); Hor. *Sat.* 1, 7, 33; Liv. 1, 56, 7-2, 7, 4; Ov. *Fast.* 2, 717; Plin. *H. N.* 34, 13, 28; Tac. *Ann.* 1, 1; Flor. 1, 9, 5; Lact. *Inst.* 7, 15, 14 and 16; Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 3, 16; Claud. 20, 141; 28, 642; Oros. 2, 5, 1; Panegy. Bähr. 11, 30, p. 268, 29; Dante *Inf.* 4, 127; and of M. Brutus in Cic. *Or.* 34; *Octav.* 10; Sen. *Suas.* 6, 14; Vell. 2, 69, 6 and 72, 1 f.; Flor. 4, 7, 1; Amm. 27, 9, 10; Dante *Inf.* 34, 65; *Par.* 6, 74.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 38.

If in Roman ears the name of Brutus had come to be synonymous with Liberty, yet more clearly and closely identified with intrepid self-sacrifice for the welfare of the State, was that of Decius. I shall here touch only incidentally upon the question of its historicity — our concern is with popular belief; no one, I suppose, doubts that by Romans of the later Republic and of the Empire, the double, if not the threefold, sacrifice was unchallenged.

As at the beginning of the Republic the war with Porsenna gave to the Instances three of their most striking exploits, those of Cocles, Scaevola, and Cloelia, — products, doubtless, of a fertility of Roman invention calculated to counterbalance a real military disaster, — so in the first Latin war the great battle of the Vesperis, B.C. 340, was signalized by a double contribution. It opened with the consul Torquatus' order for his son's execution. Its fate was decided by the self-devotion of his colleague; Decius and Torquatus, warned severally by a dream that Terra Mater and the Di Manes claimed from the one side an army, from the other a commander, had agreed that the consul whose troops first weakened, should immolate himself.<sup>1</sup>

At Sentinum, in the Third Samnite War, B.C. 295, the younger Decius, then consul, commanded against the Gallic allies, and retrieved impending defeat by imitating his father's course.<sup>2</sup> The sacrifice of the grandson — still according to the legend — inspired the stubborn resistance of the legions against Pyrrhus at Ausculum in 279.<sup>3</sup>

The third Decius is expressly cited as an *exemplum* only by Cicero:<sup>4</sup> "Fortes viri voluptatumne calculis subductis proelium ineunt, sanguinem pro patria profundunt, an quodam animi ardore atque impetu concitati? Utrum tandem censes, Torquate, Imperiosum illum, si nostra verba audiret, tuamne de se orationem libentius auditurum fuisse an meam, cum ego dicerem nihil eum fecisse sua causa omniaque rei publicae, tu contra nihil nisi sua? Si vero id etiam explanare velles apertiusque diceres nihil eum fecisse nisi voluptatis causa, quo

<sup>1</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, s. v. *Decius*, 15; Liv. 8, 6, 8 ff. and 9, 1 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. *Decius*, 16.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, s. v. *Decius*, 17.

<sup>4</sup> *Fin.* 2, 60 ff.

modo eum tandem laturum fuisse existimas? Esto, fecerit, si ita vis, Torquatus propter suas utilitates — malo enim dicere quam voluptates, in tanto praesertim viro; num etiam eius collega P. Decius, princeps in ea familia consulatus, cum se devoverat et equo admissio in mediam aciem Latinorum irruebat, aliquid de voluptatibus suis cogitabat? Ubi ut eam caperet aut quando? cum sciret confestim esse moriendum eamque mortem ardentiore studio peteret quam Epicurus voluptatem petendam putat. Quod quidem eius factum nisi esset iure laudatum, non esset imitatus quarto consulatu suo filius, neque porro ex eo natus cum Pyrrho bellum gerens consul cecidisset in proelio seque e continenti genere tertiam victimam rei publicae praeberet. Contineo me ab exemplis. Graecis hoc modicum est: Leonidas, Epaminondas, tres aliqui aut quattuor; ego si nostros colligere coepero, perficiam illud quidem, ut se virtuti tradat constringendam voluptas — sed dies me deficit. . . .” Again:<sup>1</sup> “Quotiens non modo ductores nostri, sed universi etiam exercitus ad non dubiam mortem concurrerunt! Quae quidem si timeretur, non L. Brutus arcens eum reditu tyrannum quem ipse expulerat, in proelio concidisset, non cum Latinis decertans pater Decius, cum Etruscis filius, cum Pyrrho nepos se hostium telis obiecissent, non uno bello pro patria cadentis Scipiones Hispania vidisset, Paulum et Geminum Cannae, Venusia Marcellum, Litana Albinum, Lucani Gracchum. Num quis horum miser hodie? ne tum quidem post spiritum extremum; nec enim potest esse miser quisquam sensu perempto. . . .” A general and loosely phrased appeal to “the Decii” is, of course, common enough; notable is that of Cicero, once more, seeking to justify virtue as an end in itself: “. . . Nemo est igitur quin hanc affectionem animi probet atque laudet qua non modo utilitas nulla quaeritur, sed contra utilitatem etiam conservatur fides. Talibus exemplis non fictae solum fabulae, verum etiam historiae refertae sunt, et quidem maxime nostrae. Nos enim ad sacra Idaea accipienda optimum virum delegimus, nos tutores regibus misimus, nostri imperatores pro salute patriae sua capita voverunt, nostri consules regem inimicissimum moenibus iam appropinquantem monuerunt a veneno ut caveret, nostra in republica et quae per vim oblatum stuprum voluntaria morte lueret inventa est et qui filiam interficeret,

<sup>1</sup> *Tusc.* i, 89.



ne stupraretur; quae quidem omnia et innumerabilia praeterea quis est quin intellegat et eos qui fecerint dignitatis splendore ductos immemores fuisse utilitatum suarum nosque, cum ea laudemus, nulla alia re nisi honestate duci? ”<sup>1</sup>

Both father and son are invoked together, all mention of the grandson omitted;<sup>2</sup> the father sometimes alone,<sup>3</sup> or with a loose reference to another Decius, the son never.<sup>4</sup>

We have already raised a question as to the availability of divine beings as objects of imitation.<sup>5</sup> It is interesting to note that seven *divi* (if I may extend somewhat the traditional application of this term) appear among the exempla cited as models for private citizens — several of them with considerable frequency: Aeneas, Romulus, Julius Caesar, Augustus, Trajan, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius. It would seem, then, that here also the prevailing attitude of Roman ethics coincided with that of the Stoics, in whose view “the issue of human enterprises and the disposition of the gifts of fortune were recognized as under the control of Providence; but man was master of his own feelings, and was capable of attaining such excellence that

<sup>1</sup> *Fin.* 5, 63 f.; cf. above, pp. 27, 38, 40 with n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Above, p. 36; below, p. 68.

<sup>3</sup> Auct. Herenn. 4, 57; Hor. *Sat.* 1, 6, 20; Prop. 3, 11, 62; 4, 1, 45; Sen. *Ben.* 4, 27, 2; Luc. 2, 308; Claud. 26, 126; P L M Bähr. 5, 397. Cf. Val. Max. 1, 7, 3.

<sup>4</sup> The Christian attitude toward an *exemplum fortitudinis* uncomplicated by any “conflict of duties,” may best be seen in the case of Scaevola, below, pp. 67 ff.

I add a full list of exemplary citations of the Decii: Cic. *Dom.* 64; *Sest.* 48 and 143; *Rab. Post.* 2; *Phil.* 5, 48; *Octav.* 10; *Fin.* 2, 61; 5, 64; *Tusc.* 1, 89; 2, 59; *Off.* 1, 61; 3, 16; *Sen.* 75; *Parad.* 12; Auct. Herenn. 4, 57; Verg. *Georg.* 2, 169; *Aen.* 6, 824; *Cul.* 359; Hor. *Sat.* 1, 6, 20; Sen. *Contr.* 9, 2, 9; 10, 2, 3; Prop. 3, 11, 62; 4, 1, 45; Manil. 1, 789; 4, 86; Val. Max. 5, 6, 5 f.; Sen. *Ben.* 4, 27, 2; 6, 36, 2; *Ep.* 67, 9; Sil. 15, 43; Quint. *Inst.* 12, 2, 30; *Decl.* 268, p. 93, 22; Luc. 2, 308; 6, 785; 7, 359; Stat. *Silv.* 5, 2, 53; Juv. 8, 254; 14, 239; Ampel. 20, 6; *Hist. Aug.* 26, 42, 6 (on the emperor Decius); Lact. *Inst.* 3, 12, 22; *Vir. Ill.* 26 f.; Amm. 16, 10, 3 and 23, 5, 19 (both on the emperor); Hier. *Ephes.* 1 (26, 553); Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 4, 20; 5, 14 and 18; Claud. 1, 147; 8, 404; 18, 451; 26, 126; P L M Bähr. 5, 397. In addition to the genuine citations, reference should be had also to the notices in Cic. *Phil.* 11, 13; 13, 27; *D. N.* 3, 15; *Div.* 1, 51; Liv. 8, 6, 8 ff. and 9, 1 ff.; 10, 28, 12 ff.; Val. Max. 1, 7, 3; Flor. 1, 14 and 17, 7; Min. Fel. 7, 3; Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 29, 5 (on the emperor); Eutr. 2, 13, 4; Oros. 3, 9, 1 ff. and 21, 4; Dante *Par.* 6, 47.

<sup>5</sup> Above, p. 16.

he might even challenge comparison with the gods. Audacious as such sentiments may now appear, they were common to most schools of Roman moralists. . . . Commonly . . . virtue is represented as a human act imitating God."<sup>1</sup>

Again, the essential humanity of the Roman *divi* is a thesis often insisted on by Christian apologists; Lactantius quotes Cicero to prove his point: "' . . . Atque in plerisque civitatibus intellegi potest acuendae virtutis gratia aut quo libentius rei publicae causa periculum adiret optimus quisque, virorum fortium memoriam honore deorum immortalium consecratam.' Hac scilicet ratione Romani Caesares suos consecraverunt et Mauri suos reges."<sup>2</sup> We might well, perhaps, incline to distrust the partisan statements of Lactantius and of Augustine;<sup>3</sup> this passage shows Cicero did not think of the *divi* as other than human — an increasingly large proportion of his fellow-countrymen were doubtless equally free from illusion on the point.

Not less interesting, as regards their handling of the Exempla, than the stresses of the Roman moralists, are their silences, — which often take us unawares. An instance of these we have already noted in the case of Cassius and the younger Brutus.<sup>4</sup> Equally surprising is the unimportance — for example — of Appius Claudius Caecus, Coruncanius, Manlius Acidinus, Menenius Agrippa, Coriolanus, Tanaquil, Tarpeia, Tarquin, Tullia Superbi, and Virginia.<sup>5</sup> It is a curious study to trace the development or decline of a given instance's legend.

<sup>1</sup> Lecky, *op. cit.*, I, 206 ff.; see the whole passage, also Cic. *N. D.* 3, 50, and *passim*; Min. Fel. 21, 9; Wundt, *Ethik*, part I, ch. 2, 2b, p. 75. But cf. below, p. 61, and for the general idea, Sen. *Ep.* 70, 22: "Quoniam coepi sordidis uti exemplis, perseverabo. . . . Catones Scipionesque et alios, quos audire cum admiratione consuevimus, supra imitationem positos putamus."

<sup>2</sup> *Inst.* I, 15, 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Civ. Dei* 18, 24: "Mortuum Romulum, cum et ipse non conparuisset, in deos, quod et vulgo notissimum est, rettulere Romani; quod usque adeo fieri iam desiderat (nec postea nisi adulando, non errando, factum est temporibus Caesarum), ut Cicero magnis Romuli laudibus tribuat quod non rudibus et indoctis temporibus, quando facile homines falebantur, sed iam expolitis et eruditis meruerit hos honores, quamvis nondum efferbuerat ac pullulaverat philosophorum subtilis et acuta loquacitas. Sed etiamsi posteriora tempora deos homines mortuos non instituerunt, tamen ab antiquis institutos colere ut deos et habere non destiterunt. . . ." Cf. *ibid.*, 22, 10.

<sup>4</sup> Above, pp. 42 ff.

<sup>5</sup> See above, pp. 28 ff., s. *vv.*

Sometimes we can discern, or seem to discern, the influences which led to its disuse. Tiberius Coruncanius,<sup>1</sup> the first plebeian pontifex, is repeatedly cited by Cicero in the same breath with Dentatus and Fabricius, scarcely falling below them in significance as an exemplar of old-fashioned simplicity and unassuming worth; his fame lingers desultorily through several centuries, and at length vanishes completely. I may be wrong in attributing this falling off in some degree to that metrical disability which he shared with a certain Apulian hamlet "quod versu dicere non est," *Cōruncānius* being admissible to hexameters in his vocative and genitive only, and these cases affording, it would seem, an insufficient vehicle for the transmission of a reputation to posterity!<sup>2</sup>

Again, a given instance may be modified by the disregard of one or other of contradictory attributes. Such modification is naturally most likely to occur, and also most effective, when aided by antithesis, as in the case of Marius and Sulla.<sup>3</sup> The proscriptions of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. above, p. 30, s. v.

<sup>2</sup> Coruncanius is cited as an *exemplum virtutis* by Cic. *D. N.* 2, 165; *Lael.* 18 and 39; *Sen. Contr.* 2, 1, 18; *Sen. Dial.* 7, 21, 3; *Panegy.* Bähr. 12, 9, p. 279, 11. In addition to these genuine citations, reference should be had also to the notices in Cic. *De Or.* 3, 56 and 134; *Sulla*, 23; *Dom.* 139; *Planc.* 20; *D. N.* 1, 115; 3, 5; *Sen.* 27 and 43; *Gell.* 1, 10, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Val. Max. 2, 8, 7: "L. Cinna et C. Marius hauserant quidem avidi civilem sanguinem, sed non protinus ad templa deorum et aras tetenderunt. Iam L. Sulla, qui plurima bella civilia confecit, cuius crudelissimi et insolentissimi successus fuerunt, . . . civium Romanorum nullum oppidum vexit." *Ibid.*, 9, 2, 1 f.: "L. Sulla, quem neque laudare neque vituperare quisquam satis digne potest, quia, dum quaerit victorias, Scipionem se populo Romano, dum exercet, Hannibalem repraesentavit, . . . C. Marii, cuius, etsi postea hostis, quaestor tamen aliquando fuerat, erutos cineres in Anienis alveum sparsit. En quibus actis felicitatis nomen adserendum putavit! Cuius tamen crudelitatis C. Marius invidiam levat; nam et ille nimia cupiditate persequendi inimicos iram suam nefarie destrinxit. . . . Paene tanti victoriae eius non fuerunt, quarum oblitus plus criminis domi quam laudis in militia meruit. . . ." See also Aug. *Civ. Dei*, 2, 22: ". . . Dii custodes eius (sc. rei publicae Romanae) populo cultori suo dare praecipue vitae ac morum praecepta debuerunt. . . . Si dederunt, proferatur ostendatur legatur quas deorum leges illi civitati datas contempserint Gracchi, ut seditionibus cuncta turbarent, quas Marius et Cinna et Carbo, ut in bella etiam progredierentur civilia causis iniquissimis suscepta et crudeliter gesta crudeliusque finita, quas denique Sulla ipse, cuius vitam mores facta describente Sallustio aliisque scriptoribus historiae quis non exhorreat? . . ."

Marius, the laws and victories of Sulla, will for the purposes of the Exempla be nearly or quite forgotten. Marius becomes a pure patriot, Sulla an unqualified enemy to the Republic; no praise can be extravagant as applied to the one, no denunciation too bitter as applied to the other.<sup>1</sup> For example, St. Augustine, a student of Roman history more careful than the majority of his contemporaries, when it suits his mood, does not fail to recognize and proclaim the inhumanity of Marius;<sup>2</sup> nevertheless even Augustine, by a casual mention of Marius among stock examples of the good ruler (as opposed to examples of the reverse — Caligula and others), betrays the regard in which the Second Camillus was in Augustine's time generally held: ". . . Ipse (sc. Deus) etiam regnum dedit sine cultu eorum per quorum cultum se isti (sc. Romani) regnasse crediderunt. Sic etiam hominibus: qui Mario, ipse Gaio Caesari; qui Augusto, ipse et Neroni; qui Vespasianis, vel patri vel filio, suavissimis imperatoribus, ipse et Domitiano crudelissimo. . . ." <sup>3</sup> Firmicus, on the other hand, before conversion has for Marius nothing but praise, with hatred unalloyed for Sulla: ". . . Quis deus aut exulem Marium aut felicem fecerat Sullam? . . . Et tamen postea iudicio Fortunae ille exul factus est, ille felix. . . ." <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For a singularly favorable judgment on Sulla, see Luc. 6, 787; cf. Aug. *ibid.*, 3, 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Civ. Dei*, 2, 22 f.; 5, 26.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 5, 21.

<sup>4</sup> *Math.* 1, 7, 37.

I add a full list of exemplary citations of Marius and Sulla; Marius is cited as an *exemplum virtutis* by Cic. *Verr.* 2, 3, 209; 5, 14; 25; 181; *Font.* 43; *Manil.* 60; *Rob. Perd.* 27 ff.; *Cat.* 1, 4; 3, 15; 4, 21; *Mur.* 17; *Sulla*, 23; *Red. Sen.* 38; *Red. Quir.* 7; 10; 19; *Balb.* 46; 49; *Pis.* 43; *Planc.* 88; *Fin.* 2, 105; *Tusc.* 2, 53 (cf. 35); *Rep.* 1, 6; *Off.* 1, 76; *Parad.* 16; *Att.* 9, 10, 3; Verg. *Georg.* 2, 169; Hor. *Epod.* 9, 24; Sen. *Contr.* 1, 6, 4; Vell. 2, 128, 3; Val. Max. 5, 2, 8; 6, 1, 12; 8, 2, 3; Sil. 13, 853; Juv. 8, 245; Ampel. 18, 15; *Hist. Aug.* 6, 3, 8; 11, 11, 3 and 12, 1; Firm. *Math.* 1, 7, 37; Aus. *Grat. Act.* p. 362, 231 Peiper; *Vir. Ill.* 67; Julian. *Caes.* 323 A; Hier. *Ep.* 60, 5 (22, 335: or should *Marcios* be read?); 66, 7 (*ibid.*, col. 398); Prud. *c. Symm.* 1, 524; Aug. *Civ. Dei*, 5, 21; Claud. 21, 371; 24, 35; 26, 126; P L M Bähr. 5, 399: as an *exemplum viti* by Cic. *Phil.* 11, 1; *Tusc.* 5, 56; *D. N.* 3, 80 f.; *Off.* 3, 79 ff.; Val. Max. 3, 6, 6; 5, 6, 4; 9, 2, 2; Sen. *Dial.* 4, 2, 3; *Ben.* 5, 16, 2; *Ep.* 94, 66; Plin. *H. N.* 33, 150; Luc. 2, 546; 4, 822; 6, 794; 9, 204; Tac. *Hist.* 2, 38; *Hist. Aug.* 11, 6, 4; Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 39, 6; *Epit.* 48, 12; Aug. *Civ. Dei*, 2, 22 f.; 5, 26; Dracont. *ap. P L M Bähr.* 5, 145; Panegy. Bähr. 12, 46 (p. 313, 7). Cf.

A process somewhat similar to the above may, in the case of exempla of like name, sacrifice a narrower reputation to a wider, obliterating almost or quite completely the less known. A striking instance is that of Claudius Nero,<sup>1</sup> who with Livius commanded against Hasdrubal at the Metaurus — according to Creasy, the most brilliant and momentous exploit of Roman military history. "To this victory of Nero's," says Lord Byron, "it might be owing that his im-

also Plut. *Vit.* In addition to the genuine citations, reference should be had also to the notices in Cic. *De Or.* 3, 8; *Cat.* 3, 24; *Har.* 54; *Sest.* 37 ff.; 50; 116; *Prov. Cons.* 32; *Mil.* 8; 83; *Phil.* 8, 7; *Acad.* 2, 13; *Div.* 2, 140; *Att.* 9, 10, 3; Liv. *Epit.* 80 *fin.*; 66-80 *passim*; Sen. *Contr.* 1, 1, 3 and 5; 7, 2, 6; Ov. *Pont.* 4, 3, 44; Manil. 4, 45; Vell. 2, 11, 1 ff.; 22, 1 ff.; 128, 3; Val. Max. 1, 3, 4; Nep. 2, 2, 3; 3, 1; 8, 7; 3, 1, 2 and 8, 5; 4, 3, 14; 6, 9, 14; 7, 6, 4; 8, 9, 2 and 15, 7; 9, 12, 4 and 15, 1; Sen. *Dial.* 10, 17, 6; Luc. 2, 90 and *passim*; 8, 269; Juv. 10, 278; Flor. 3, 21, 2 and 19; Ampel. 42, 1 ff.; 47, 4; Amm. 30, 8, 9; Symm. *Laud. Val.* 1, p. 319, 26; *Ep.* 9, 115, p. 266, 31; Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 3, 27 ff.; Claud. 15, 92; 26, 646; Oros. 5, 15, 8; 17, 3; 19, 8-23 *passim*; 20, 1; 22, 5 ff.; 6, 2, 9; P L M Bähr. 4, 66; 6, 360.

Sulla is cited as an *exemplum virtutis* by Cic. *Att.* 9, 10, 3; Val. Max. 5, 2, 9; 6, 5, 7; Sen. *Dial.* 6, 12, 6; Sil. 13, 855; Luc. 2, 582; 6, 787; Mart. 11, 5, 9; Ampel. 18, 16; *Vir. Ill.* 75; Amm. 16, 5, 1 and 12, 41; as an *exemplum viti* by Cic. *Lig.* 12; *Phil.* 11, 1; *Fin.* 3, 75; *Off.* 1, 43 and 109; 2, 27; *Att.* 7, 7, 7; 9, 11, 3; 10, 7, 1; Caes. *ibid.*, 9, 7 C, 1; Sen. *Contr.* 2, 4, 4; 9, 2, 19; *Suas.* 6, 3; Val. Max. 1, 2, 3 Par.; 3, 6, 3; 5, 6, 4; 9, 2, 1 and 3, 8; Sen. *Dial.* 3, 20, 4; 4, 2, 3 and 34, 3; 5, 18, 1; *Ben.* 5, 16, 3; *Clem.* 1, 12, 1 ff.; Sil. 13, 855; Luc. 2, 221 ff.; 4, 822; 9, 204; Tac. *Hist.* 2, 38; Juv. 2, 28; *Hist. Aug.* 7, 8, 1; 11, 6, 4; 13, 2, 2; 4, 10; 5, 4; Firm. *Math.* 1, 7, 34 ff.; Aur. Vict. *Caes. Epit.* 48, 12; Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 2, 22 ff.; 5, 26; Claud. 3, 253; Dracont. *ap. P L M Bähr.* 5, 145; Panegy. Bähr. 9, 20 (p. 208, 18); 12, 7 (p. 277, 13); 12, 46 (p. 313, 7). Cf. also Plut. *Vit.* In addition to these genuine citations, reference should be had also to the notices in Cic. *Verr.* 2, 3, 81; *Manil.* 8; *Cluent.* 151; *Leg. Agr.* 2, 81; *Cat.* 3, 9 and 24; *Mur.* 32; *Har.* 54; *Phil.* 8, 7; *Att.* 9, 10, 2 ff.; Liv. *Epit.* 66; 75-90 *passim*; Vell. 2, 22, 1; 25, 1 ff.; 28, 2 ff.; 66, 1; Val. Max. 2, 8, 7 and 10, 6; 3, 1, 2; 5, 2, 9; 6, 4, 4; 5, 7; 8, 2; 9, 6; 7, 6, 4; 8, 14, 4; 9, 2, 1 and 15, 5; Plin. *H. N.* 7, 137 ff.; 33, 134; Luc. 1, 326; Mart. 9, 43, 10; 11, 5, 9; Stat. *Silv.* 4, 6, 107; Flor. 3, 21, 2 and 19; Ampel. 42; 47, 4; Tert. *Apol.* 11 (1, 337 A); Solin. 1, 127; Arn. 5, 38 (5, 1153 B); Aus. *Grat. Act.* p. 363, 249 Peiper; Eutr. 4, 27, 4; Amm. 16, 5, 1; Prud. *c. Symm.* 2, 562; Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 3, 7, 27 ff.; Claud. 21, 370; 28, 383; Oros. 5, 21, 1 ff.; 22, 5-18 *passim*; P L M Bähr. 6, 360.

<sup>1</sup> Cited as an exemplum only by Manil. 1, 791 and Sil. 8, 413; irrelevantly motivated are Hor. *Carm.* 4, 4, 37 ff. and Suet. *Tib.* 2. For the emperor, see below, p. 55, with n. 4.

perial namesake reigned at all. But the infamy of the one has eclipsed the glory of the other. When the name of Nero is heard, who thinks of the consul! But such are human things.<sup>1</sup>

Most significant in the development of the Exempla seems to me a striking limitation of their range in point of time; that is, of the historical period from whose content they were drawn. In the table above I have distinguished by an obelisk † the names of persons whose deaths occurred later than the battle of Actium.<sup>2</sup> Let us briefly review them, in order approximately chronological, with reference to a conspectus of the passages in which they are cited as instances: —

A. Private citizens of the Imperial period

I. Who lived under both Republic and Empire:

1. Q. Sextius, Sen. *Ep.* 98, 13. Cf.<sup>3</sup> *ibid.* 73, 12–15; *Dial.* 5, 36, 1.
2. M. Vipsanius Agrippa, Manil. 1, 798; Val. Max. 4, 7, 7; Sen. *Ben.* 3, 32, 4; *Ep.* 94, 46. Cf. Sen. *Contr.* 2, 4, 12–13; Solin. 1, 66.
3. C. Cilnius Maecenas, Sen. *Ep.* 120, 19; Mart. 10, 73, 4.
4. M. Gavius Apicius, Sen. *Dial.* 7, 11, 4; *Ep.* 120, 19; Mart. 10, 73, 3; Juv. 4, 23; 11, 3; *Hist. Aug.* 17, 18, 4.<sup>4</sup>
5. L. Cassius Nomentanus, Sen. *Dial.* 7, 11, 4.
6. C. Iulius Licinus, Varr. *Atac. ap. Bährens, Poetae Latini Minores*, 4, 64; Sen. *Ep.* 119, 9; 120, 19; Pers. 2, 36; Juv. 1, 109; 14, 306.
7. Octavia soror Augusti, Sen. *Dial.* 6, 2, 3 ff.
8. Livia Augusti, *ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> Cited by Creasy, *The Battle of the Metaurus, init.*

<sup>2</sup> Above, p. 26, n. 2, *med.*

<sup>3</sup> Passages to which attention is thus called are not cases of genuine exemplary citation.

<sup>4</sup> Quoting Heliogabalus.

## II. Who lived only under the Empire:

1. C. Caesar Agrippae filius, Sen. *Dial.* 11, 15, 4.
2. Nero Claudius Drusus Germanicus Tiberi frater, Val. Max. 4, 3, 3; Aus. *Grat. Act.* 373, 511;<sup>1</sup> Prud. c. *Symm.* 1, 279. Cf. Claud. 8, 455; 21, 193.
3. Iulius Kanus,<sup>2</sup> Sen. *Dial.* 9, 14, 4-10; Boëth. *Consol.* 1, *pr.* 3.
4. Pallas divi Claudii libertus, Juv. 1, 109.
5. L. Annaeus Seneca, Boëth. *Consol.* 1, *pr.* 3. Cf. *ibid.* 3, *pr.* 5.
6. Servilius Barea Soranus, *ibid.* 1, *pr.* 3, l. c.
7. Arria maior, Plin. *Ep.* 6, 24, 5. Cf. *ibid.* 3, 16; Mart. 1, 13.
8. Sexx. Quintilii Condianus et Maximus, Amm. 28, 4, 21. Cf. for the similar case of the brothers Scribonii, Tac. *Hist.* 4, 41.

## B. Emperors:

I. Augustus,<sup>3</sup> for

- (a) *virtus imperatoria pro patria exercita*, Val. Max. 2, 1, 10;<sup>4</sup> Juv. 8, 242;<sup>5</sup> Ampel. 18, 21; *Hist. Aug.*

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps Germanicus the nephew of Tiberius is meant.

<sup>2</sup> Also *Canus* and *Canius*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Vell. 2, 61, 3 f.; 66, 1 f.; 71, 1; 79, 3; 80, 2 ff.; 83, 2; 85, 4 ff.; 89; 90, 3 f.; 110, 6; 123, 2; 124, 3; 126, 1; Val. Max. 1, 7, 1 f.; 4, 3, 3 and 7, 7; 7, 6, 6 and 7, 3 f.; 9, 15, 2 and 5 ff.; Sen. *Ben.* 3, 27 and 32, 5; Plin. *H. N.* 7, 147 ff.; Tac. *Ann.* 1, 1; 3, 28; Flor. 4, 12, 64 ff.; Antonin. 4, 33; 8, 5; Ampel. 40, 4; 47, 7; Solin. 1, 48 f.; *Hist. Aug.* 30, 3, 1; Eutr. 7, 8, 4 ff.; 8, 5, 3; Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 3, 30; 22, 10; *Cons. Ev.* 1, 23, 32 (32, 1056); Oros. 3, 8, 3 ff.; 6, 1, 6 f. and 22, 3 f.; 7, 6, 5; Dante, *Inf.* 1, 71; *Purg.* 29, 116; *Par.* 6, 73. Augustus is cited as an example for another emperor by Sen. *Contr.* 2, 4, 13; *Hist. Aug.* 6, 11, 6; 25, 2, 3; Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 5, 21.

<sup>4</sup> Among other emperors, not expressly mentioned; cf. below, p. 67, with n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Where Juvenal cites Augustus only to contrast him unfavorably with Cicero:

Hic novus Arpinas, ignobilis et modo Romae  
municipalis eques, galeatum ponit ubique  
praesidium attonitis et in omni monte laborat.  
Tantum igitur muros intra toga contulit illi  
nominis ac tituli, quantum vi Leucade, quantum  
Thessaliae campis Octavius abstulit udo  
caedibus adsiduus gladio, sed Roma parentem,  
Roma patrem patriae Ciceronem libera dixit.

10, 21, 2; "Aur. Vict." *Vir. Ill. add.* 79; Symm. *Laud. Val.* 1, p. 322, 11; Claud. 18, 218; *incert. ap.* Bährens *P L M* 5, 400.

- (b) *pietas* × *impietas*, Claud. 28, 117.<sup>1</sup>
- (c) *constantia in morte propinquorum*, Sen. *Dial.* 6, 15, 2; 11, 15, 3.
- (d) *clementia*, Dracont. *Gunth.* 180.<sup>2</sup>

## II. Later Emperors

- (a) Cited together with Republican exempla, Val. Max. 2, 1, 10;<sup>3</sup> *Hist. Aug.* 10, 21, 3 ff.; 13, 2, 2; Ambros. *Ep.* 1, 18, 7 (16, 973B); Symm. *Laud. Val.* 1, p. 322, 12 ff.; Claud. 8, 313 ff.
  - 1. Tiberius, thrice.
  - 2. Nero, thrice.
  - 3. Trajan, once.
  - 4. Antoninus Pius, twice.
  - 5. Marcus Aurelius, twice.
- (b) Cited without Republican exempla:<sup>4</sup> only Nero, Antonin. 3, 16; Aug. *Civ. Dei*, 5, 19; Boëth. *Consol.* 2, m. 6; 3, m. 4.

To men of any but the first century of the Empire, then, the Roman instances were, it appears, everything but modern, opening far

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp. 13 f.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. below, p. 56, n. 2, *ad init.*

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 67, with n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> In the great mass of references to these later emperors which the literature of the Imperial period presents, I cannot be sure that my collection of independent citations is as exhaustive as that of the citations in connection with Republican exempla; though I believe I have missed very few of either class. I have not gathered by any means all the citations of an emperor as an example for other emperors. The passages which I have noted — *Hist. Aug.* 4, 28, 10; 6, 11, 6; 17, 1, 1 and 33, 1; 25, 2, 3; 26, 42, 6; 27, 6, 4; 30, 3, 2; Aus. *Grat. Act.* p. 373, 511; Amm. 21, 16, 8; Ambros. *Obit. Theod.* 50 (16, 1403 A); Symm. *Ep.* 1, 13, p. 9, 17; Prud. *c. Symm.* 1, 278 f.; Claud. 8, 316; 20, 61: cf. Boëth. *Cons.* 3, pr. 5 — contain express citations of Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, Vitellius, Titus, Domitian, Nerva, Trajan, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Commodus, Septimius (? see Prud. *l. c.*) Severus, and Heliogabalus. On the omission of Hadrian, cf. *Hist. Aug.* 10, 21, 3.



back in the legendary period, and closing, as the series seems to have done, abruptly in full splendour with the fall of the Republic: Marius, Sulla, Pompey, Catiline, Cato, Julius Caesar <sup>1</sup> — then a silence, where even the name of Augustus is almost unheard; so sharp is the line of demarcation.<sup>2</sup> Before it has been set, any act as it might seem of

<sup>1</sup> Together with a multitude of minor instances; see above, pp. 28 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The younger Cato is of all the Instances perhaps the most frequently cited. Julius Caesar is cited as an *exemplum virtutis* by Verg. *Aen.* 6, 789; 826; Hor. *Carm.* 1, 12, 47; Sen. *Contr.* 10, 3, 1 and 5; Prop. 3, 18, 34; Val. Max. 2, 1, 10; 3, 2, 19; 4, 5, 6; 5, 1, 10; Sen. *Dial.* 4, 23, 4; 6, 14, 3; Plin. *H. N.* 7, 91 ff. and 99; Sil. 13, 864; Quint. *Decl.* 379, p. 423, 27; Mart. 6, 32, 5; 11, 5, 11; Antonin. 8, 3; Ampel. 18, 20; Solin. 1, 106 f.; *Hist. Aug.* 6, 11, 6; 10, 21, 1; 18, 62, 3; 21, 7, 7; Firm. *Math.* 1, 7, 41; *Vir. Ill. add.* 78; Amm. 28, 4, 18; 29, 2, 18; Prud. *Perist.* 2, 14; Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 5, 12; Claud. 28, 400; Dracont. *Gunth.* 175; P L M Bähr. 5, 400; Panegy. Bähr. 9, 15, p. 204, 16: as an *exemplum viti* by Cic. *Off.* 1, 26 f. and 43; 2, 23 f.; 27; 84; 3, 19 and 82 f.; fr. B. & K. 39, II, 4; Sen. *Ben.* 5, 16, 5; *Ep.* 94, 65; Dracont. *ap. P L M Bähr.* 5, 145; Panegy. Bähr. 12, 46, p. 313, 8. Cf. also Plut. *Vit.* In addition to the genuine citations, reference should be had also to the notices in Cic. *Marc.* 28; *Phil.* 1, 35; 2, 110; *Att.* 15, 20, 2; *Fam.* 13, 8, 2; Liv. *Epit.* 103–116 *passim*; Manil. 4, 57; Vell. 2, 41, 1 f.; 50, 1; 52, 4 ff.; 55, 2; 56 f.; Val. Max. 1, 6, 13; 8, 8 and 10; 2, 10, 7; 3, 2, 23; 4, 5, 5; 5, 7, 2; 6, 2, 11 and 6, 15; 7, 6, 5; 8, 9, 3 and 11, 2; 9, 8, 2; 15, 1 and 5; Sen. *N. Q.* 5, 18, 4; Petron. 120, l. 64; Sil. 13, 864; Stat. *Silv.* 1, 1, 23; Tac. *Ann.* 1, 1; 3, 28; Juv. 10, 108; Flor. 4, 2, 90 ff.; Antonin. 3, 3; Ampel. 40, 3; 47, 6; *Hist. Aug.* 19, 18, 2; Lact. *Inst.* 1, 15, 28; 3, 18, 12; 6, 18, 34; Eutr. 6, 25; "Hege-sippus" *de Bell. Iud.* 1, 27 (15, 1986 C); Amm. 21, 16, 13; Aug. *Civ. Dei.* 3, 30; 5, 12; 9, 5; *Cons. Ev.* 1, 23, 32 (32, 1056); *Ep.* 138, 2, 9 (33, 529); Claud. 8, 311; 15, 49; Oros. 6, 17, 1; 7, 2, 14; P L M Bähr. 5, 403; Empor. *ap. R L M Halm* 567 ff.; Dante, *Inf.* 4, 123; *Purg.* 18, 101; 26, 77; *Par.* 6, 57; 16, 10.

This difference in treatment of Julius and of Augustus is curiously illustrated in the catalogues of Heroes as framed by Virgil and by Manilius. In *Aeneid* 6, Anchises names first the Latin kings of Alba, then Romulus, then Julius Caesar and Augustus (789 ff.), then without notice returns from the divine descendants of Aeneas to the series of exempla — Numa and his successors, Brutus and the rest, among them (826 ff.) Pompey and Julius Caesar, and so on through Fabius Maximus. The double mention of Julius both among the *divi* and, at greater length, among the exempla, has against all MS. authority been avoided by the transpositions of some editors. The place of Augustus in the series is identical with that given him by Manilius, who, closing his catalogue of the Exempla with Cato of Utica and Agrippa, proceeds (1, 798 ff.; cf. Breiter *ad loc.*):

. . . Venerisque ab origine proles  
Iulia descendit caelo caelumque replevit,  
quod regit Augustus socio per signa tonante,

purely local significance may, given favorable conditions and reflected in the mirror of Roman greatness, win for the doer a place in the first order of the Exempla — such are the credentials of Cloelia, of Fabricius, of Serranus; under the Empire, no event, however far-reaching its consequences, leaves trace among them. Men like Germanicus,<sup>1</sup> Agricola, Verginius Rufus, who rejected opportunities of self-advancement reducing in comparison those of Fabricius to the scale of a country village, are never cited.<sup>2</sup> The emperors, even so good material as Nero, are cited very rarely indeed,<sup>3</sup> in connection with the Republican instances still more rarely; as a rule, they are made objects of imitation for other emperors only, not for private individuals. The fourth century private citizen does not say to his son, "Marcus Aurelius was a good man, let us imitate him"; but Theodosius will say to Honorius, "The office of emperor has been well filled by Marcus Aurelius; his rule should be our model; avoid the precedents of Domitian."

cernit et in coetu divum Magnum atque Quirinum  
altius aetherii quam candet circulus orbis.  
Illa deum sedes, haec illis proxima, divum  
qui virtute sua similes vestigia tangunt.

<sup>1</sup> But cf. above, p. 54, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Very rarely the great Stoics of the first century; Caecina Paetus, Thræsea, and Helvidius never. Cf. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, pp. 65, 143-145 especially, and 147 ff.; *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, 1905<sup>2</sup>, pp. 116, 163 f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above, pp. 54 f., with notes, and *Hist. Aug.* 11, 11, 3 ff.: ". . . Idem (sc. Pescennius) in contione iuravit se, quamdiu in expeditionibus fuisset essetque adhuc futurus, non aliter egisse acturumque esse quam militem, Marium ante oculos habentem et duces tales. Nec alias fabulas umquam habuit nisi <de> Annibale ceterisque talibus. Denique cum imperatori facto quidam panegyricum recitare vellet, dixit ei: 'Scribe laudes Marii vel Annibalis <vel> cuiusvis ducis optimi vita functi et dic quid ille fecerit, ut eum nos imitemur. Nam viventes laudare inrisio est, maxime imperatores, a quibus speratur, qui timentur, qui praestare publice possunt, qui possunt necare, qui proscribere.' Se autem vivum placere velle, mortuum etiam laudari. Amavit de principibus Augustum, Vespasianum, Titum, Traianum, Pium, Marcum, reliquos feneos vel venenatos vocans; maxime tamen in historiis Marium et Camillum et Quinctium <et> Marcium Coriolanum dilexit. Interrogatus autem quid de Scipionibus sentiret, dixisse fertur felices illos fuisse magis quam fortes; idque probare domesticam vitam et iuventutem, quae in utroque minus speciosa domi fuisset."

But, one may query, is the Romans' failure to employ examples drawn from Imperial times sufficiently established by the fact of slight reference in the literature? Contemporary and nearly contemporary citations are discounted:<sup>1</sup> is not the tone of the later Imperial literature prevailingly Christian? and will there not be a natural reluctance on the part of Christian writers to use heathen examples from the Imperial period, when they conceive the good man as necessarily a Christian? Let us glance at the nature and scope of our evidence, with a view to determining, if possible, whether in completeness and validity it justifies our first conclusions.

The claim of Scipio Aemilianus to a place among the Examples would be sustained by the citations in the Republican literature alone. The fame of the younger Cato need not have survived the reign of Claudius to assure him similar rank. The hero, then, it appears, may through citation not dictated by social or political bias attain unquestioned status as an *exemplum* within one hundred years from his death. That is, the great historical personages of the first three generations of our era might have attained such standing more than a century before the persecution of Diocletian.

Even from the period after the official recognition of Christianity by the State, a considerable body of non-Christian citations of exempla have reached us.<sup>2</sup> A far greater proportion, undoubtedly, of the pagan than of the Christian literature of this period has perished, notably of that class of pagan literature which was more than any other given to citing of examples — the products of the declaimers' schools. A glimpse at the character of these for the later period comes from the Manichaean Secundinus' polemic against Augustine:

<sup>1</sup> Above, p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> I subjoin a list of the authors in whose works I have found exemplary citations, beginning roughly with the second century A. D. and italicising the names of Christians: Martial, Statius, Tacitus, Juvenal, Pliny, Florus, Calpurnius Flaccus, Suetonius, Fronto, *Minucius Felix*, Appuleius, Antoninus, Gellius, Ampelius, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, Solinus, *Arnobius*, *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, *Lactantius*, *Firmicus* (a late convert), *Ausonius* (Christian by convention), Aurelius Victor, *Scriptor de Viris Illustribus*, Festus, Eutropius, Obsequens, Julian, "*Hegesippus*" de Bello Iudaico, Ammianus, *Hieronymus*, *Ambrosius*, Symmachus, *Prudentius*, *Augustine*, Claudian, Macrobius, Rutilius Namatianus, *Orosius*, *Paulus Petricordensis*, *Dracontius*, Boëthius. Claudian alone has a great many; cf. above, pp. 39 f., with notes, and 42, n. 4.

“ . . . Visus enim mihi es, et pro certo sic est, et numquam fuisse Manichaeum nec eius te potuisse arcana incognita secreti cognoscere, atque sub Manichaei nomine persequi te Hannibalem atque Mithridatem. Ego namque fateor non tali diligentia nec tanta industria Anicianae domus micare marmora quanta tua scripta perlucunt eloquentia. . . .”<sup>1</sup> This bit of testimony may point the way to a method of obtaining more. We shall not expect to find Christian apologists citing with approval heathen examples from the Imperial period. We shall expect to find them, and as a matter of fact have found them,<sup>2</sup> attacking at least the greater heathen examples adduced by disputants on the other side: examples from the Empire are not among these.

Our literary evidence, then, while incomplete, may be taken to be fairly representative. It would be absurd to deny that the declaimers and apologists of the Empire ever made use of the many available examples drawn from the Imperial period no citations of whom have come down to us; equally clear is it that none of these possible Imperial examples attained a currency at all commensurate with that of the great majority of Republican eligibles.<sup>3</sup>

For this difference in attitude toward men of Imperial times, the range of possible causes is too wide to allow more than a very brief treatment here. It seems right to distinguish those which may be supposed to have led to the rejection of the private citizen from the greater number of considerations which enter into the case of an emperor.

The Republic may have seemed to men of later time, even more than we now apprehend, an heroic or “golden” age<sup>4</sup> distinct from their own; here not less than in Greek tragedy’s restriction of its subjects, we may recognize “today’s unwillingness to idealize the men of yesterday.” Such a motive is, I believe, of not uncommon appearance in Roman thought.<sup>5</sup> A striking parallel to this phase of

<sup>1</sup> *Ep. ad Aug.*, ap. Migne, 42, 574; cf. Juv. 10, 167.

<sup>2</sup> Above, pp. 39 ff.; cf. below, 67 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. below, p. 61, n. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, pp. 144 and 312.

<sup>5</sup> Dill, *op. cit.*, p. 537: “. . . The cheerless negation of Epicurus, and the equally withering theology of the Stoics, could not weaken in Roman hearts the spell of ancestral pieties which clustered round the vault near the grey old country

its operation is the similar distinction of periods within the Empire itself noticed by Symmachus writing to Ausonius: “. . . Bonus Nerva, Traianus strenuus, Pius innocens, Marcus plenus officii temporibus adiuti sunt, quae tunc mores alios nesciebant; hic in laude est natura principis (*sc.* Gratiani), ibi priscae munus aetatis. Cur verso ordine ista optimarum artium putemus exempla et illa de saeculo priore vestigia? . . .”<sup>1</sup> The exact application of Symmachus’ pronouns here is to me far from plain; but his general purport, I think, cannot be mistaken. Tacitus, on the other hand, in his notice of Arminius suggests a division coincident in time with that which we have to make; he has here, seemingly, no thought of the Instances: “. . . Dolo propinquorum cecidit, liberator haud dubie Germaniae, et qui non primordia populi Romani, sicut alii reges ducesque, sed florentissimum imperium lacessierit, proeliis ambiguus, bello non victus. Septem et triginta annos vitae, duodecim potentiae explevit, caniturque adhuc barbaras apud gentes, Graecorum annalibus ignotus, qui sua tantum mirantur, Romanis haud perinde celebris, dum vetera extollimus, recentium incuriosi. . . .”<sup>2</sup>

house of the race, looking down on the Tyrrhene sea, or the awe of ancient grove or spring sacred to Silvanus and the Nymphs, or the calm, chastened joy in a ritual in which every act was dictated by a love of ceremonial cleanness and exactness, and redolent of an immemorial past.” Cf. Prud. *c. Symm.* 2, 298 ff.:

. . . Ipsa casas fragili texat gens Romula culmo.  
Sic tradunt habitasse Remum: regalia faeno  
fulcra supersternant, aut pelle Libystidis ursae  
compositam chlamydem villosa corpore gestent! . . .  
Roma antiqua sibi non constat, versa per aevum,  
et mutata sacris, ornatu, legibus, armis;  
multa colit quae non coluit sub rege Quirino;  
instituit quaedam melius, nonnulla refugit. . . .

<sup>1</sup> *Ep.* 1, 13, p. 9. Cf. what he writes to his father comparing the latter’s task in composing his *Hexasticha* (see below, p. 63) with the similar undertaking of Varro, *ibid.*, 1, 4, p. 5: “. . . Ille pauperem Curium, sed divitibus imperantem; ille severos Catones, gentem Fabiam, decora Scipionum, totumque illum triumphalem senatum parca laude perstrinxit: tu rutavam proximae aetatis inluminas. Difficile factu est ut honor angustis rebus addatur. . . .”

<sup>2</sup> *Ann.* 2, 88 *fin.* See Dill, *op. cit.*, pp. 58 f.: “Both Juvenal and Tacitus are united in a passionate admiration for the old Roman character. Their standards and ideals are drawn from the half-mythical ages of the simple warriors and farmer-statesmen of the old Republic.” Cf. *ibid.*, p. 29.

No subject of an emperor could possibly rival the claim of the emperor himself to recognition among the Instances;<sup>1</sup> but even in the emperor's case, servility toward the reigning *princeps* might prevent that recognition. Furthermore, every emperor who might possibly have become an *exemplum virtutis*, was upon his decease forthwith by the Senate declared divine.<sup>2</sup> If we were right in ascribing the relative infrequency of national examples in Christian literatures partly to the relatively greater availability of Divine examples which they enjoy, we cannot now, — especially with the cases of Romulus and Julius Caesar in mind, — argue that the emperors were altogether excluded from the Exempla by the supposed fact of their divine nature;<sup>3</sup> but it is of course evident at the same time that to minds less thoroughly pervaded by the Stoic doctrine of the dignity of human nature,<sup>4</sup> an act or personality must become less valid as an example to mankind just in proportion as its pre-eminence was conditioned on the possession of attributes superhuman, not shared by the individual to whom it might be addressed.<sup>5</sup> So, I have heard, the example of Jesus was by the early Church cited almost exclusively; as the doctrines of His divine nature and differentiation from humanity gained general acceptance, St. Paul became the most frequently cited example.

<sup>1</sup> For the Emperors as examples, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 31 and 144.

<sup>2</sup> Later, in the case of Constantine the Great, consecration by the Senate and canonization by the Church go hand in hand; cf. J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, vol. 1, 1881, p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Any absolute categorical limitation of the Exempla would be as false as it would be senseless. General tendencies, it seems, must rather be sought, alike in questioning the availability of the *divi* and of Imperial examples, and in assuming that the *hostis* is likely to be an *exemplum viti*.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. above, pp. 16 and 48 f.

<sup>5</sup> The emperors *damnatae memoriae* are, indeed, somewhat more frequently cited than the *divi*. I do not suppose that this fact has any bearing on the point here at issue. The exalted station of the *principes*, whether or not *damnatae memoriae*, as heads of what was in men's thought long before it was in name "The Holy Roman Empire" (cf. Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte*, 1, pp. 43, 75 f.; Dill, *Last Century*, p. 10; Carter, *Religious Life*, pp. 66 ff.), would perhaps in any case raise them above the level of mere humanity. Against their adoption as *exempla viti*, as against that of the private citizen of the Empire, the feeling for the "golden age" must still operate, greater weight attaching to the example of the "hoary sinner"! Cf. *Hist. Aug.* 11, 11, 3 ff. (above, p. 57, n. 3).

These are some of the causes which may have contributed to the discontinuance of the series of Roman national exempla with the end of the Republic. I do not believe, however, that we have yet touched, save incidentally, on the greatest influence responsible for the refusal of the Exemplary canon (as we may now fairly call it) to admit additions to its number, and for its further crystallizing through the elimination of certain of its former members and the reduction of others to a simplified or uniform type. That influence was, I feel sure, a literary influence — an influence proceeding from and through some form or forms of literature. At first I supposed we might look for it in a generally received, standard Book of Moral Examples. Let us glance for a moment at the scope and character of the Roman works of this sort, notice of which has come down to us:<sup>1</sup> —

- \*1. M. Terentius Varro Reatinus, *Imaginum* vel *Hebdomadum* libri xv.<sup>2 3</sup> A popular edition, *Epitome*, in four books was published by Varro himself.
- \*2. Cornelius Nepos, *Exemplorum* libri v (+ ?).<sup>2</sup> Cf. Gell. 6, 18, 11: "Cornelius Nepos in libro Exemplorum quinto . . . litteris mandavit."
- \*3. C. Iulius Hyginus, *De Vita Rebusque Inlustrum Virorum* libri vi (+ ?).<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ascon. ad Cic. *Pis.* p. 13 Or., 12 K-S: "Varronem tradere . . . Iulius Hyginus dicit in libro priore de viris claris"; Gell. 1, 14, 1: "Iulius Hyginus dicit in libro de vita rebusque inlustrum virorum sexto." Is Asconius' reference to an *Epitome*?
- 4. Valerius Maximus, *Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium* libri ix.
- 5. C. Plinius Secundus, *Naturalis Historiae* libri xxxvii; especially 7, also 33-34.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Works not extant are noted by an asterisk.

Cf. Ausonius, *Monosticha et Tetrasticha de Caesaribus*, pp. 183-193 Peiper; the last emperor included is Heliogabalus. The books of Santra and Suetonius, Jerome and Gennadius, *De Viris Illustribus*, dealt only with the biography of men of letters. See on the first two, Hier. *Vir. Ill., praef., ap.* Migne, 2, 821; on Jerome and Gennadius, Teuffel-Schwabe, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, 1913<sup>6</sup>, §§ 434, 6d and 469, 12.

<sup>2</sup> See M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, s. v.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 60, n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> See F. Münzer, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius*, Berlin, 1897, pp. 324 ff.

6. L. Ampelius, *Liber Memorialis*.<sup>1</sup>
- \*7. Alfius Avitus, (*Rerum*) *Excellentium libri ii* (+ ?).<sup>1</sup>
8. C. Iulius Solinus, *Collectanea Rerum Memorabilium*.<sup>1</sup>
9. Incertus, *De Viris Illustribus Urbis Romae capita* lxxxvi (including a supplement).<sup>1</sup> This is usually incorporated with the *Caesares* of Sex. Aurelius Victor and a later *Origo Gentis Romanae*.
- \*10. L. Aurelius Avianius Symmachus (pater Q. Symmachi oratoris), *de viris illustribus Hexasticha*.<sup>1 2</sup>
11. Incertus, *De Viris Illustribus Hexasticha*.<sup>3</sup>

For the more important of these books, questions of sources, interrelationships, content, arrangement, preservation, and the like, have been pretty carefully worked out.<sup>4</sup> There seems to be no indication that any one of them dealt exclusively or distinctively with *exempla virtutis*, to say nothing of a restriction to national exempla alone.<sup>5</sup> Among the extant books, those which make the nearest approach to such a classification appear to be the anonymous writings (9 and 11) *de viris illustribus*; their registers coincide to a considerable degree with the *exempla maiora* of my list. The author of the *Hexasticha*, however, admits no heroines.

May we not, nevertheless, discover certain trace of another Book of Examples, notice of which might conceivably have failed to reach us? One method of establishing the existence of such a manual might make use of unmistakable repetitions of phrase by several authors in dealing with a given instance. Suppose the manual were drawn up toward the close of the Republic; we might find its phraseology perpetuated by, say Livy, Seneca, Lucan, Gellius, Arnobius, and Claudian, as well as by some of the professed books of exempla.

<sup>1</sup> See Schanz, *op. cit.*, s. v.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 60, with n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ap. Bähr. P L M* 5, 396 ff.; Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, 1906, 831 ff. Cf. Teuffel-Schwabe, *op. cit.*, § 425, 1, *fin.*

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., B. Krieger, *Quibus fontibus Valerius Maximus usus sit in eis exemplis enarrandis quae ad priora rerum Romanarum tempora pertinent*, Berlin, 1888; L. Traube, *Untersuchungen zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte römischer Schriftsteller*: 1. *Zu Valerius Maximus*, in *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, 1891, pp. 387 ff. Cf. above, p. 62, n. 4, and p. 5, n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. above, p. 7, with n. 3. Treatment of national heroes, either exclusively or as a class, is familiar enough; e.g., Plutarch's *Lives*, and *Vir. Ill.*, above, 9.



A partial illustration of this process is afforded in the legend of Cloelia; Silius Italicus writes:<sup>1</sup>

. . . Facta virum sileo; rege haec et foedere et annis  
et fluvio spretis, *mirantem* interrita Thybrim  
tranavit frangens undam puerilibus ulnis. . . .

Claudian, inveighing against Eutropius, seemingly harks back to Silius' allusion, and puts it one better:<sup>2</sup>

Martius eunuchi repetet suffragia campus ? . . .  
Visceribus frustra castum Lucretia ferrum  
mersit, et *attonitum* tranavit Cloelia Thybrim ?

Such references illustrate admirably, also, the precariousness of a method fraught with all the perils of "the deadly parallel passage," augmented tenfold by the practical necessity of establishing, in effect, that the passages adduced are too like to be independent, yet too unlike to be the result of direct imitation. Happily we are relieved from such responsibility by the lack of any disproportionate frequency of coincidence, any religious jealousy of phrase, which would indicate the pre-existence of an especially revered Book of Instances. Notice of such a Book could, indeed, hardly have failed altogether to reach us.

The true Book of Instances, for the Roman, as for the Hebrew moral teacher, is surely a larger thing; is to be sought, in fact, undoubtedly, in the authority of a somewhat indefinite canon of great writers, historians and others, from the best period of the nation's literature.

We cannot now but underestimate the ascendancy of what must have been for the later Republic and for the early Empire the first great book of the series, a book which as a source of moral examples — I suppose — came nearer than anything else in Roman literature to the historical books of the Hebrew Old Testament — the *Annals* of Ennius. We can judge only by his eulogies of Dentatus —

*quem nemo ferro potuit superare nec auro*

— and of Fabius the Delayer.<sup>3</sup> The direct influence of the *Annals* on exemplary citation was, for the earlier Empire, I feel sure, stronger

<sup>1</sup> 10, 492.

<sup>2</sup> 18, 447; cf. above, p. 40, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the currency attained by such phrases as "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon"; "Thou leddest Thy people like a flock, by the hand of Moses and Aaron."

than that of any prose historical work, excepting possibly that of Livy.<sup>1</sup> Their indirect influence is beyond calculation; for they were the inspiration of Cicero and of Virgil.<sup>2</sup>

The temper of Cicero, intensely patriotic and reverent of antiquity, — according to many, the glory which he himself coveted, has made the appeal to precedent a distinctive characteristic of his writing. Fame, granting him rank the reverse of conspicuous among the Examples,<sup>3</sup> has yet exceeded his highest aspiration in their regard: to him it was given to be a principal gate by which others should pass into the Temple. One could hardly expect that all his most cherished ideals would win like recognition at the hands of posterity;<sup>4</sup> I was surprised to find, on the other hand, that among the greatest examples of my list, two only, and those the least frequently cited by later writers — Cloelia and Curtius, are not mentioned by him. Of scarcely less moment is the influence of Virgil, who has, however, nothing to say of Lucretia, Cincinnatus, Fabricius, Regulus, Hannibal, Claudia, or Sulla; he sets a fashion in Roman literature for later poets by converting the Homeric motives of *νεκρία* and pictured shield to a glorification of the Heroes.<sup>5</sup> Similar passages are accorded a conspicuous place by Horace,<sup>6</sup> Manilius,<sup>7</sup> Lucan, and Silius Italicus.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For Livy, cf. above, p. 15, n. 3; H. Taine, *Essai sur Tite Live*, 1860<sup>2</sup>, p. 15, and *passim*; Teuffel-Schwabe, *op. cit.*, § 257, 4.

<sup>2</sup> For Lucretius, cf. above, p. 12, with n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 6, with n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> E.g., see above, p. 50, with n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Aen.* 6, 756 ff.; 8, 626 ff. Cf. R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*, 1903, pp. 472 ff.; E. Norden's edition of *Aen.* 6, 1903, p. 353, *ad fin.*, and *passim*; Dill, *op. cit.*, pp. 491, 494; Warde Fowler, *Religious Experience*, p. 391; Donatus, on *Aen.* 6, 841 ff.: "Omnes isti diversis artibus, meritis quoque et virtute floruerunt; quos Vergilius ex persona Anchisis dicit non esse praetermittendos, et propter exempla optima tradendos memoriae posterorum." For Virgil's purpose in the *Aeneid* as a whole, see Warde Fowler, *op. cit.*, pp. 409 ff., esp. 418.

<sup>6</sup> E.g., *Carm.* 1, 12, 33 ff.

<sup>7</sup> A close copy of Virgil; 1, 777 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. 14, 680 ff.:

. . . Aemulus ipse (sc. Marcellus)  
ingenii superum, servando condidit urbem;  
ergo exstat saeculis stabitque insigne trophaeum,  
et dabit antiquos ductorum noscere mores.

Statius' work is mostly on Greek subjects.

Interesting are the glimpses at colloquial use of exempla given by Petronius, who makes Eumolpus ask, "Quae autem hic insidiae sunt, aut quis nobiscum Hannibal navigat?"<sup>1</sup> Of all first century writers, however, the most untiring devotee is Seneca; who sees in Cato of Utica the "perfect man" of Stoic theory: "... Habes, Serene, perfectum illum virum, humanis divinisque virtutibus plenum, nihil perdere. . . . Non est quod dicas ista, ut soles, hunc sapientem nostrum nusquam inveniri. . . . Qualem confirmamus, exhibuimus et exhibebimus, raro forsitan magnisque aetatum intervallis unum. Neque enim magna et excedentia solitum ac vulgarem modum crebro gignuntur. Ceterum hic ipse M. Cato, a cuius mentione haec disputatio processit, vereor ne supra nostrum exemplar sit."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 101, 4 (Bücheler). Hannibal has become the type of perfidy, — unlike Jonah! See also 9, 5: "... Accucurrit coepitque mihi velle pudorem extorquere. Cum ego proclamarem, gladium strinxit, et 'Si Lucretia es,' inquit, 'Tarquinius invenisti' . . . ." And again, 132, 15:

Quid me constricta spectatis fronte Catones,  
damnatisque novae simplicitatis opus?

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.* 2, 6, 8 ff.; see above, p. 20, n. 1, *init.* and *fin.* Seneca's whole attitude toward Cato is one of wilful blindness to his faults, in the perhaps praiseworthy determination to create a perfect ideal, like that of Christ, for the redemption of society. See Martha, *Les Moralistes*, pp. 44 f. Cf. *Ep.* 67, 13 (above, p. 4) and *Dial.* 2, 2, 1 f.: "Respondi . . . Catonem autem certius exemplar sapientis viri nobis deos immortales dedisse quam Ulixen et Herculem prioribus saeculis. . . . Cato non cum feris manus contulit . . . adversus vitia civitatis degenerantis et pessum sua mole sidentis stetit solus et cadentem rem publicam, quantum modo una retrahi manu poterat, tenuit, donec vel abreptus vel abstractus comitem se diu sustentatae ruinae dedit simulque extincta sunt quae nefas erat dividi. Neque enim Cato post libertatem vixit nec libertas post Catonem." So *ibid.*, 1, 3, 4-14, *passim*: "... Fortuna fortissimos sibi pares quaerit, quosdam fastidio transit, contumacissimum quemque et rectissimum adgreditur, adversus quem vim suam intendat: ignem experitur in Mucio, paupertatem in Fabricio, exilium in Rutilio, tormenta in Regulo, venenum in Socrate, mortem in Catone. Magnum exemplum nisi mala fortuna non invenit. . . . Quod ad Catonem pertinet, satis dictum est summamque illi felicitatem contigisse consensus hominum fatebitur. Quem sibi rerum natura delegit cum quo metuenda collideret. 'Inimicitiae potentium graves sunt: opponatur simul Pompeio, Caesari, Crasso. Grave est a deterioribus honore anteiri: Vatinio postferatur. Grave est civilibus bellis interesse: toto terrarum orbe pro causa bona tam infeliciter quam pertinaciter militet. Grave est sibi manus adferre: faciat. Quid per haec consequar? ut omnes sciant non esse haec mala, quibus ego dignum Catonem putavi.'" Again, *Ep.* 51, 12: "... Habitaturum tu putas umquam fuisse in mica Catonem, ut

The work of the elder Seneca, with other extant writings of the same sort, makes plain that first century eloquence followed faithfully the Ciceronian tradition of precedents. Yet clearer testimony than any thus preserved are the handbooks of exempla made for the declaimers' use,<sup>1</sup> notably that of Valerius Maximus. This is a courtierly book, bearing all the earmarks of an age when "dedications to the prince" were in fashion.<sup>2</sup> The influence of the declamatory school appears in Juvenal nowhere more conspicuously than in his appeals to the Instances, which are always direct, fervent, and in good faith.<sup>3</sup> Martial shows a disposition not to take them too seriously. In a jesting vein which reminds one of a Greek's attitude towards deity, he protests against their tiresome rectitude.

Downright attack on the Examples, however, began with Christianity. Its mildest form manifests itself in a depreciation of their pretensions by contrast with Jewish or Christian models; so, as an example of compassion, Moses is preferred to Fabricius by St. Ambrose:<sup>4</sup> "Memorable ferunt rhetores quod dux Romanorum, cum ad eum adversarii regis medicus venisset, pollicens daturum se regi venenum, vinctum eum ad hostem remisit. Et revera praeclarum. . . . Redeamus ad nostrum Moysen, atque ad superiora revertamur, ut quanto praestantiora, tanto antiquiora promamus. . . ." Elsewhere a stronger animus against the Roman heroes becomes apparent,

praenavigantes adulteras dinumeraret et tot genera cymbarum variis coloribus picta et fluitantem toto lacu rosam, ut audiret canentium nocturna convicia? nonne manere ille intra vallum maluisset, quod in unam noctem manu sua ipse duxisset? Quidni mallet, quisquis vir est, somnum suum classico quam symphonia rumpi? . . ." Cf. *Dial.* 9, 16; and above, p. 7, n. 1.

On the other greatest moral teacher of the first century, Plutarch, see above, p. 20, n. 1, *med.*

<sup>1</sup> These contain material of the nature suggested by Sen. *Suas.* 7, 14 *fin.*, p. 583, 11 (Müller): ". . . Alteram rem (*sc.* fatuam fatuorum amabilissimus Gargonius) dixit, cum exempla referret eorum qui fortiter perierant: 'Iuba et Petreius mutuis vulneribus concucurrerunt et mortes faeneraverunt.' . . ." Cf. Victorinus on Cic. *Rhet.* 2, 26, *ap. R L M* Halm p. 284, 8: "*Relatio criminis est cum reus id quod arguitur confessus alterius se inductum peccato iure fecisse demonstrat. . . . Quae constitutio tunc est cum alterius peccato se fecisse reus dicit quidquid admisit; huius exemplum subiecit Horati, qui sororem suam flentem interfecit. . . .*"

<sup>2</sup> E.g., 2, 1, 10; 6, 1 *praef.* and 4, 5; and *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above, p. 60, n. 2; and for Juvenal, Dill, *op. cit.*, pp. 63 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *De Officiis Ministrorum*, 3, 15, 91 (16, 171 A).

and a systematic campaign of disparagement is instituted, proceeding by four distinct methods. All these are well illustrated in the case of Scaevola.

The controversialist's first point of attack is, naturally, any characteristic weakness exhibited by the Instance in question — some trait, oftentimes, equally offensive to Roman and to Christian. This is seized upon, aggravated — in many cases to a ridiculous degree, and relentlessly pressed home. Or the exploit on which rests the hero's title to fame, is minimized: “. . . Eant Romani,” exclaims Lactantius, “et Mucio glorientur aut Regulo, quorum alter necandum se hostibus tradidit, quod captivum puduit vivere, alter ab hostibus deprehensus, cum videret mortem se vitare non posse, manum foco iniecit, ut pro facinore suo satisfaceret hosti quem voluit occidere, eaque poena veniam quam non meruerat accepit. . . .”<sup>1</sup> Special charges failing, the stock reproaches can always be brought.

Desire for renown among posterity, “the last infirmity of noble minds,” is scored against Scaevola by Tertullian:<sup>2</sup> “Mucius manum suam dexteram in ara cremavit ut hoc factum eius fama haberet.” So Lactantius, of Curtius and the Decii:<sup>3</sup> “. . . Illi qui pro salute civium voluntariae se neci optulerunt, sicut Thebis Menoeceus, Athenis Codrus, Romae Curtius et Mures duo, numquam mortem vitae commodis praetulissent nisi se immortalitatem opinione civium consequi putavissent. . . .” Cyprian does not hesitate to make vainglory Brutus' motive for the slaying of his sons.<sup>4</sup>

Patriotism, again, should in the Christian view yield to thoughts of the Heavenly country. The same charges of worldliness are brought by Augustine and Dracontius against Scaevola as against Brutus.<sup>5</sup>

Lastly, the efficacy of pagan *virtus* itself is denied. The Heroes wrought under a misapprehension, their efforts were misdirected, hence they could not attain true virtue, which is conditioned upon, and inseparable from, true piety (*vera pietas, vera religio*). Refusal

<sup>1</sup> *Inst.* 5, 13, 13. Cf. above, p. 38, with n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Mart.* 4 (I, 625 B). Cf. above, *l. c.*

<sup>3</sup> *Inst.* 3, 12, 22. Cf. *Aug. Civ. Dei*, 5, 13 f. and 18–20; 22, 10; Dante, *Purg.* 7, 85 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Above, p. 41.

<sup>5</sup> Above, pp. 41 f. Cf. Dante, *Purg.* 7, 18.

to accept this principle was a chief heresy of Pelagius, vigorously combated by Augustine:<sup>1</sup> “ . . . Acerbissimi gratiae huius inimici exempla nobis opponitis impiorum quos dicitis ‘ alienos a fide abundare virtutibus, in quibus sine adiutorio gratiae solum est naturae bonum, licet superstitionibus mancipatum; qui solis libertatis ingentiae viribus et misericordes crebro et modesti et casti inveniuntur et sobrii.’ . . . Sed absit ut sit in aliquo vera virtus nisi fuerit iustus. Absit autem ut sit iustus vere nisi vivat ex fide: *Iustus enim ex fide vivit.*<sup>2</sup> Quis porro eorum qui se Christianos haberi volunt, nisi soli Pelagiani, aut in ipsis etiam forte tu solus, iustum dixerit infidelem, iustum dixerit impium, iustum dixerit diabolo mancipatum? sit licet ille Fabricius, sit licet Fabius, sit licet Scipio, sit licet Regulus, quorum me nominibus, tanquam in antiqua Romana curia loqueremur, putasti esse terrendum. . . . Ad hoc eos in die iudicii cogitationes suae defendent,<sup>3</sup> ut tolerabilius puniantur, quia naturaliter quae legis sunt utcumque fecerunt, scriptum habentes in cordibus opus legis hactenus ut aliis non facerent quod perpeti nollent; hoc tamen peccantes, quod homines sine fide non ad eum finem ista opera retulerunt ad quem referre debuerunt. Minus enim Fabricius quam Catilina punietur, non quia iste bonus, sed quia ille magis malus; et minus impius quam Catilina Fabricius, non veras virtutes habendo, sed a veris virtutibus non plurimum deviando. An forte et istis qui exhibuerunt terrenae patriae Babylonicam dilectionem, et virtute civili, non vera, sed veri simili, daemonibus vel humanae gloriae servierunt, Fabriciis videlicet et Regulis et Fabiis et Scipionibus et Camillis ceterisque talibus, sicut infantibus qui sine baptismo moriuntur, provisuri estis aliquem locum inter damnationem regnumque caelorum, ubi non sint in miseria, sed in beatitudine sempiterna, qui Deo non placuerunt, cui sine fide placere impossibile est, quam nec in operibus nec in cordibus habuerunt? non opinor perditionem vestram usque ad istam posse impudentiam prosilire. ‘ Erunt ergo,’ inquis, ‘ in damnatione sempiterna in quibus erat vera iustitia?’ O

<sup>1</sup> *Contra Iulianum Pelagianum*, 4, 3, 16–26 (44, 744 ff.); cf. *Civ. Dei*, 19, 24 fin. and 25; *Ep.* 138, 3, 17 (33, 533); Pelagius, *Ad Demetriadem Ep.* 3, ap. Migne, 30, 18 C–D.

<sup>2</sup> *Rom.* 1, 17.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 2, 14 ff.

vocem impudentia maiore praecipitem! non erat, inquam, in eis vera iustitia; quia non actibus, sed finibus, pensantur officia. . . ."

The pagan exempla are withal seldom referred to by Cyprian, Arnobius, Ambrose,<sup>1</sup> and — save in a single passage<sup>2</sup> — Dracontius. More frequent are the allusions of Minucius Felix, Tertullian, Lactantius, and Prudentius.<sup>3</sup> Jerome<sup>4</sup> and Augustine<sup>5</sup> dwell on the familiar names not without something of that lingering affection which marked the renunciation of their beloved classics. Non-committal are the rare allusions of Boëthius.

Yet the last century of Roman sovereignty did not lack for defenders of the old order. As numbers waned, the more was devotion intensified. In the Middle Empire a season of lukewarmness had set in. Now as the hostile faiths flooded in upon the wreck of paganism, as provinces crumbled and fell successive prey to the barbarian, men turned with a pathetic yearning to the glorious ideals of the Augustans, and drew from the remembrance of them consolation, if little hope. The splendor of the Heroes' cult was never more than at its setting. In the last days of the Western Empire, while the tides threatening momentarily to engulf the remnant of paganism, slackened and receded for a little, the *γλωσσήματα* of Marcus Aurelius<sup>6</sup> shine with rekindling brightness in the pages of Symmachus<sup>7</sup> and of Claudian.<sup>8</sup>

. . . . .

Opportunity is not without its compensations. The reader will often have been reminded of these in following the present study. Our search has led us beyond the beaten tracks of ancient religious science, into a region uncharted by the Romans themselves. No decree of magistrate or assembly has methodized the cult of the Heroes, no Varro defined their place in the scheme of Roman religious thought. Yet we may not slight them. There is surely, it has seemed

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Off. Min.* 3, 15, 91 (16, 171 A: above, p. 67); *Ep.* 1, 18, 7 ff. (16, 973 B).

<sup>2</sup> *De Deo* 3, 312 ff. (above, pp. 39 ff., *passim*).

<sup>3</sup> *C. Symm.* 2, 553 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf., e.g., *Iovin.* 2, 11 (23 = 2, 341).

<sup>5</sup> Cf., e.g., *Ep.* 138, 3, 17 (33, 533).

<sup>6</sup> 4, 33.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. above, p. 60.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. above, p. 58, n. 2, *fin.*

to me, but the one course — to face with determination the difficulties of the moral problem — for him who would gain a true perspective of Roman spiritual life; to fail to do so is to make the great refusal. The stake is worth the hazard: if I am right, he who accepts such a challenge will find himself taking a wider view, presently, of modern, not less than of ancient conditions. May future service of the Instances prove as fruitful of instruction to their minister as I have found it!